

VOLUME XII

APR 20 1917

NUMBER 2

CHICAGO  
LIBRARY  
*April 1917*

---

# CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

---

*A Quarterly Journal devoted to research  
in the Languages, Literatures, History,  
and Life of Classical Antiquity* ♦ ♦

---

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

---

*Agents: The Cambridge University Press, London and Edinburgh; The Maruzen-Kabushiki-  
Kaisha, Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka, Sendai; The Mission Book Company, Shanghai*

# CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

## EDITORS

CHARLES HENRY BEESON  
ROBERT JOHNSON BONNER  
CARL DARLING BUCK

PAUL SHOREY, *Managing Editor*  
WILLIAM GARDNER HALE  
GORDON JENNINGS LAING  
ELMER TRUESDELL MERRILL

FRANK JUSTUS MILLER  
HENRY W. PRESCOTT  
FRANK BIGELOW TARBELL

## ASSOCIATE EDITORS

FRANK FROST ABBOTT, *Princeton University*  
WILLIAM ARTHUR HEIDEL, *Wesleyan University*  
GEORGE LINCOLN HENDRICKSON, *Yale University*  
FRANCIS W. KELSEY, *University of Michigan*  
WALLACE M. LINDSAY, *University of St. Andrews*  
HANNES OERTEL, *Yale University*

JOHN WILLIAMS WHITE, *Cambridge, Mass.*

WILLIAM PETERSON, *McGill University*  
SAMUEL BALL PLATNER, *Western Reserve University*  
JOHN C. BOLF, *University of Pennsylvania*  
CHARLES FORSTER SMITH, *University of Wisconsin*  
ANDREW FLEMING WEST, *Princeton University*  
BENJAMIN IDE WHEELER, *University of California*

VOL. XII

CONTENTS FOR APRIL 1917

No. 2

Kroll on the Independent Latin Subjunctive	By Charles E. Bennett	121
Beati Possidentes Ithakistae	By A. Shewan	132
References to Painting in Plautus and Terence	By Charles Knapp	143
Petronius and the Greek Romance	By C. W. Mendell	158
Studies in Greek Noun-Formation: Dental Terminations I.	By Carl D. Buck	173
Notes and Discussions		190

F. B. TARBELL: A Supposedly Rhodian Inscription Re-examined.—ROY J. DEFERRARI: On the Date and Order of Delivery of St. Augustine's Tractates on the Gospel and Epistle of St. John.—SAMUEL BALL PLATNER: *Varia Topographica*.—G. A. HARRER: *Tacitus Agricola* 44. 1.—CORNELIA C. COULTER: A Seventeenth-Century Parody of Catullus 4.—PAUL SHOREY: Note on Plato ([I] *Theages* 124E).

## Book Reviews

202

ADLINGTON-GASELER: *Apuleius: The Golden Ass* (Abbott).—MANNING: *A Study of Archaism in Euripides*.—FRÖTHERS: *The Chorus of Euripides* (Flickinger).—MELMOTH-HUTCHINSON: *Pliny, Letters* (Hobbin).—ROBERT: *Oldipus. Geschichte eines poetischen Stoffes im griechischen Altertum* (Moore).—RADIN: *The Jews among the Greeks and Romans* (Wright).—BOUCHIER: *Spain under the Roman Empire; Syria as a Roman Province* (Schoonover).—VON SCALIA: *Das Griechentum in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung*.—CAUER: *Das Altertum in Leben der Gegenwart*.—FISLER: *Die Homerische Dichtung* (Nollin).—FIECHTER: *Die baugeschichtliche Entwicklung des antiken Theaters* (Allen).—MARTIN: *The Birds of the Latin Poets* (Richardson).—STAMPINI: *Studi di Letteratura e Filologia Latina* (Merrill).—STEWART: *Selections from Ovidius (Ullman)*.—DECKE: *Auswahl aus den Hiaschotien zur Einführung in die antike Homerphilologie* (Scott).—KROLL-SKUTSCH-ZIGLER: *Fulvi Firmici Materni Mathematici libri VIII* (Moore).—BARBELENET: *De l'aspect verbal en Latin ancien et particulièrement dans Terence* (Hodgman).—STEHL: *Case Usage in Livy* (Nutting).—LAMB: *Clio Enthroned: A Study of Prose-Form in Thucydides* (Smith).

Classical Philology is published quarterly in the months of January, April, July, and October, by the University of Chicago at the University Press. The subscription price is \$3.00 per year; the price of single copies is \$1.00. Orders for service of less than a half-year will be charged at the single-copy rate. Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States, Mexico, Cuba, Porto Rico, Panama Canal Zone, Republic of Panama, Hawaiian Islands, Philippine Islands, Guam, Samoa Islands, Shanghai. Postage is charged extra as follows: For Canada, 15 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$3.15), on single copies, 4 cents (total \$1.04); for all other countries in the Postal Union, 25 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$3.25); on single copies, 6 cents (total \$1.06). Patrons are requested to make all remittances payable to the University of Chicago Press in postal or express money orders or bank drafts.

The following agents have been appointed and are authorized to quote the prices indicated:

For the British Empire: THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, Fetter Lane, London, E.C. 4, England. Yearly subscriptions, including postage, 13s. 3d. each; single copies, including postage, 4s. 4d. each.

For Japan and Korea: THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA, 11 to 13 Nihonbashi Tori Sanchoh, Tokyo, Japan. Yearly subscriptions, including postage, Yen 9.50; single copies, including postage, Yen 2.15.

For China: THE MISSION BOOK COMPANY, 15 Peking Road, Shanghai. Yearly subscriptions, \$3.00; single copies, \$1.00, or their equivalents in Chinese money. Postage extra, if mailed direct outside of Shanghai, on yearly subscriptions 25 cents, on single copies 6 cents.

Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and when the reserve stock will permit. Deliveries are not guaranteed within the war zones of Europe nor in other countries where transportation is disturbed by conditions incident to war.

Business correspondence should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.

Communications for the editors and manuscripts, which must be typewritten, should be addressed to the Editor of CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY, The University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Entered as second-class matter, June 20, 1906, at the Post-office at Chicago, Ill., under the Act of July 16, 1894.







# Classical Philology

VOLUME XII

April 1917

NUMBER 2

## KROLL ON THE INDEPENDENT LATIN SUBJUNCTIVE

BY CHARLES E. BENNETT

In a recent issue of *Glotta* Wilhelm Kroll has a lengthy and significant article on the Latin subjunctive.<sup>1</sup> Kroll's entrance into the field of syntactical discussion is sudden and unexpected—doubtless to himself as well as to others. While well and favorably known in other fields, he had never before devoted attention—at least in his published work—to questions of Latin syntax. Even in the article to which I am inviting attention he confesses that his familiarity with certain standard syntactical works is recent. However, Kroll's general eminence as a Latinist and classical philologist, combined with the novelty and boldness of the opinions he enunciates, compels consideration of his views.

For forty-five years—ever since Delbrück published his *Konjunktiv und Optativ im Sanskrit und Griechischen*—opinion has gradually been crystallizing in favor of the views therein set forth. Delbrück's position is familiar and needs no restatement here. It has not passed without challenge—notably from Abel Bergaigne in France and from Morris in our own country. Morris denies "Grundbegriffe" for inflected forms; Bergaigne had not only done that, but had contested for Vedic the thoroughgoing application of the modal values set up for subjunctive and optative by Delbrück. There had been other dissenters. Most of these were not scholars whose names carried great weight, and their dissent, as a rule, was only partial.

<sup>1</sup> "Der potentiale Konjunktiv im Lateinischen," *Glotta*, VII, 117-52.

On the whole, it is fair to assert that a decided unanimity of opinion—especially in the last quarter of a century—had come to exist as to the values and functions of the Greek subjunctive and optative and of the Latin subjunctive, so far as the employment of these moods in independent sentences was involved. When I speak of unanimity of opinion, I mean, naturally, on the part of those whose researches and published works entitled them to be heard. The names of Delbrück, Brugmann, Stahl, Schmalz, Blase, Landgraf, Stegmann, Riemann, Lindsay, Hale illustrate my meaning. All these scholars and hundreds of others who give adherence to their teachings have long recognized a pure future and a volitive function in the Greek subjunctive; a “wish” meaning and a “should-would” (or potential) function in the Greek optative. For the Latin, a volitive function, referred to the Indo-European subjunctive for its origin, has been recognized; likewise the “wish” and “potential” meanings, which have been regarded as lineal descendants of the Indo-European optative. Even those who have felt compelled to exercise reserve in connecting Greek or Latin syntactical phenomena with Indo-European forms have nevertheless as a rule recognized the actual usages of the Greek and Latin subjunctive and optative in substantially the terms I have stated.

As regards these views, Kroll is frankly iconoclastic. He enters into no discussion of the Greek moods, but as to the Latin subjunctive in independent sentences he denies the true optative or wish use as distinct from the volitive; he likewise denies an original potential use for the subjunctive in Latin, while in a considerable number of cases he interprets as pure futures, Latin subjunctives which no one hitherto has had the hardihood to take in this sense. He naturally attaches great importance to the evidence of Early Latin and bases his conclusions largely upon Plautine usage.

Barring certain individual observations of Kroll, I am unable to agree with any of his conclusions. He is unwilling to recognize in the Latin subjunctive any traces of the Indo-European optative. Optative forms, he frankly admits, appear in the Latin subjunctive, but optative functions, as recognized in Greek and Sanskrit, he refuses to accept. Evidently he starts out with the avowed intention of recognizing in the Latin subjunctive only the functions

peculiar to the Indo-European subjunctive. As a general principle of philological method, this procedure cannot be too severely condemned. Our science has already suffered enough from such attempts to make the interpretation of the text square with some preconceived conception as to the nature of a modal or case form. This tendency was most extreme, of course, in Gottfried Hermann, but for over a century we have gradually been growing away from it, and its revival in present-day investigation is deeply to be deplored. I feel that Kroll has ignored or jauntily dismissed from consideration certain facts of prime importance for the settlement of the problems of the Latin subjunctive. This is especially true in his attitude toward the "wish" and the "should-would" optatives. The facts are plain. All perfect subjunctives in Latin are optatives; and several presents—particularly presents in very common use, viz., *sim* (including *possim*), *velim*, *nolim*, *malim*, and in Early Latin (on whose testimony Kroll lays great stress) *edim*, *duim* *perduim*. Now the testimony of Greek, Sanskrit, Iranian, and, to some slight extent, of other Indo-European languages shows that the optative had the "wish" function. Why not, therefore, recognize the "wish" use of the Latin subjunctive as an inheritance of the Indo-European optative? There are indeed special reasons for so doing in the Latin of Plautus, to which Kroll attaches such importance, for in Plautus it is a fact—first pointed out, I believe, by Morris<sup>1</sup>—that the majority of independent perfect subjunctives (true optative formations) are used to express a wish. I find it impossible to reject the great cogency of this evidence. Kroll fails to reckon with it or even to allude to it. These "wish" subjunctives, he declares, are nothing but volitives. To his mind *statim ad me redeas* and *utinam ad terram incolumis redeas* are logically identical. To me this is merely a "Machtspruch." If any two things are logically distinct, it seems to me that the jussive and optative uses of the Latin subjunctive are distinct. The one is, "Drop that gun!" the other is, "I hope you'll have a pleasant journey." The one implies authority and control on the part of the speaker; the other just as distinctly implies that the speaker's power does not exist and that he throws himself entirely on the outcome of fortune.

<sup>1</sup> *Amer. Jour. Phil.*, XVIII, 166.

To me, therefore, it is clear that Kroll has not succeeded in his attempt to eliminate the optative subjunctive from Latin. The purpose of such elimination was to pave the way for the denial of the other of the two uses of the Indo-European optative in Latin, viz., the so-called "potential" or "should-would" use. Kroll disputes this use also, his object being to disprove, for the Latin subjunctive, the presence of any functions inherited from the Indo-European optative. There have been various assaults in recent years on the Latin potential; but these have been on the "may" potential and the "can" potential. Elmer questioned the existence of these in an elaborate discussion contained in Vol. VI of *Cornell Studies*. He dealt with expressions of the type *aliquis dicat, quispiam dixerit* as illustrating the "may" potential; and *videas, cernas, credas; videres, cerneres, crederes* as types of the "can-could" potential. So far as I know, no one has accepted his conclusions. Kroll not only rejects the "may" and "can-could" potentials, but, what is entirely new, rejects the "should-would" potential as well. Let us undertake to follow his reasoning. It is best to proceed at once to the consideration of concrete examples. Kroll confines himself mainly to Plautus as representing most nearly the primitive state of things for Latin. The illustrations cited by me in my *Syntax of Early Latin* (and by everybody else from time immemorial) Kroll declares to be spurious. Among the passages he specifically cites are *Trin.* 994, *qui sis qui non sis, floccum non interduim*. This is traditionally interpreted as meaning, "I wouldn't give a straw to know who you are, or who you aren't." Kroll says it means, "Ich mag keinen Deut dafür geben, zu wissen wer du bist," etc. In other words, he rejects a natural and easily explained interpretation in favor of an unnatural and unaccountable one. How can *interduim* mean "Ich mag geben"? Can *amem* mean "Ich mag lieben"? Or *eam*, "Ich mag gehen"? The same applies to his interpretation of *quod tibi suadeam, suadeam meo patri* (*Capt.* 237). In *Bacch.* 149 we have *O barathrum, ubi nunc es? ut ego te usurpem lubens!* I interpret this as meaning, "O bottomless abyss, where are you now? How I would gladly use you!" Kroll contents himself with the observation that my interpretation is "unverständlich." I fancy he takes it as a purpose clause. This might be possible, were it not for *lubens*.



With *lubens* it seems to me my interpretation is not only possible but necessary. *Aul.* 569 reads: *potare ego tecum volo: non potem ego quidem hercle*. Kroll says this means "I will not drink with you." In other instances hitherto ordinarily taken as potentials, Kroll finds a pure future meaning. No one hitherto has had the boldness to recognize the pure future meaning in the independent uses of the Latin subjunctive. Hale had recognized it in certain types of dependent clauses—his anticipatory subjunctive. But he has been followed by very few. Kroll, however, is ready to see it in independent sentences, e.g., *Truc.* 907, *numquam hoc uno die efficiatur opus*, which he takes as meaning "this job will not be finished in a single day"—precisely as though Plautus had written *efficietur*. So in *Amph.* 1060, *nec me miserior feminast neque ulla videatur magis*. *Asin.* 558 reads: *edepol virtutes tuas qui nunc possis conlaudare, sicut ego possim?* "How would you be able to commend your merits, as I would?" Kroll dismisses this with the remark that the "Möglichkeit" is in the meaning of *possim*, not in the subjunctive. If that is so, why doesn't Plautus use the indicative? Other examples that assert plainly their potential ("should-would") character, but are rejected by Kroll, are *Aul.* 489, *hoc quis non credat abs te esse ortum?* *Eun.* 460, *ex homine hunc natum dicas?* *Pseud.* 290, *egon patri subripere possim quicquam?* If these are future indicatives in sense, I fail to see why Latin employed the subjunctive.

A special class of cases is recognized by Kroll in *velim*, *nolim*, *malim*. In *velim adeas*, *velim progredi*, etc., it is clearly impossible to take the *velim*, *nolim*, *malim* as futures. Kroll therefore has recourse to the view advanced some twenty years ago by Morris, viz., that we have in *velim veniat* a species of attraction—not like what we ordinarily call attraction, where the subordinate verb is attracted to the main verb, but the reverse, where the main verb is attracted to the subordinate. Now the odd thing is that we have nothing else like this in Latin or—so far as I know—in any other language. Kroll, following Morris, would have us believe that *volo veniat* becomes *velim veniat* owing to the *veniat*, or, as he puts it, "Die ganze Vorstellung liegt in der Sphäre des Wunsches und das führt dazu dass man das den Wunsch ausdrückende Verbum in den Modus des Wunsches setzt." Very well. Why then in *edico abeas*, *praecipio*

*fatearis, moneo desinas, jubeo custodias*, and literally hundreds of similar expressions in Plautus, do we never find an *edicam abeas, praecipiam fatearis, moneam desinas, jubeam custodias*? The situation is precisely similar.

There is also another serious objection to the Kroll-Morris view. In Plautus *velim* occurs with the simple subjunctive some 14 times. Against these 14 instances, we have 27 other instances of *velim* unaccompanied by the subjunctive, including 10 with the infinitive, 7 with participles and adjectives, 4 with a direct object, and 6 absolute uses. As for *malim*, that is found twice with the subjunctive. Against these 2 instances there are 21 others where there is no accompanying subjunctive, including 13 with the infinitive, 4 with participles and adjectives, 1 with a direct object, and 3 absolute uses. *Nolim* does not occur with the subjunctive, but is found twice with the infinitive and once with a participle. Out of 70 occurrences, therefore, of *velim*, *nolim*, *malim*, *pervelim*, 54 are not accompanied by the subjunctive. Granting now that attraction may account for the 16 cases of the subjunctive, how are we to account for the subjunctive in the 54 remaining cases? Kroll, following Morris, accounts for them by analogical extension, i.e., we are asked to believe that *aquam velim, lapidem velim, malim vincere, emortuom me malim* along with *ut velim, malim quidem, istuc mavelim*, all stand in the subjunctive by analogical extension. I can see no basis for such analogical extension; *aquam, lapidem, istuc* do not represent equivalents of dependent clauses. Moreover, the whole theory is based on the assumption that *velim* with a dependent subjunctive is historically earlier than *aquam velim, lapidem velim, ut velim, istuc mavelim*, etc. There is nothing to show that this is true. In fact, it seems intrinsically improbable. Kroll is satisfied when he declares "*velim* ist höchstens Höflichkeitsausdruck für *volo*." But I can see no "Höflichkeit" in *lapidem velim*; or in *ut velim*, in *illam diruptam velim, me pervelim sepultam, malim amicos mersos*, or dozens of other similar expressions that might be cited from Plautus. I see a distinct potential force—a "should-would" meaning: "I should like some water," "I'd like to have a rock," "I should like to be dead and buried," "I should like to have her knocked into a cocked hat," "I should prefer that."

At times, to be sure, some of these *velim*'s, *nolim*'s, *malim*'s do become "Höflichkeitsausdrücke," and it is simply because of the potential force that this "Höflichkeitston" arises, precisely as in English our "I should say," or "No one would believe this," is more courteous, because more qualified and guarded, than a bold "I say," "No one believes."

I pass to the examples of the imperfect subjunctive. Of this usage I have cited for Early Latin some 50 examples, all of which seem to me clear potentials. Some of these are of *vellem*, *mavellem*. In view of what he has already urged in connection with *velim*, *nolim*, *malim*, Kroll feels justified in dismissing these with a reference to his previous discussion, e.g., *Asin.* 589, *vellem habere*; *Poen.* 1107, *magis quam vellem*; *Amph.* 512, *experiri istuc mavellem*. Examples of potentials other than *vellem*, *mavellem* are more frequent, but these also are rejected by Kroll, e.g., *Bacch.* 313, *ibidem publicitus servarent:: occidistis me*; *nimio hic privatim rectius servaretur*. Kroll says that this is a wish, despite the obvious absurdity of the interpretation and the well-known fact that *utinam* is always present with the imperfect subjunctive. Take again *Poen.* 1139, *hodie earum mutarentur nomina*, which Kroll translates "Heute sollten ihre Namen geändert werden," where German "sollten" is the equivalent of "were on the point of being." Kroll says the *mutarentur* is volitive, but I submit that "sollten" is not volitive in his German rendering. Take again *Men.* 160, *en edepol ne tu esses agitator probus*. "You'd make a good charioteer," which, Kroll declares, is equivalent to *si agitator esses*, *esses probus*. Suppose it is: we shall have to account for the subjunctive in apodosis. But of that later.

Kroll addresses himself also to the perfect subjunctive. Of this tense I have cited some 35 examples in independent potential uses for Early Latin. Kroll contests all of these, citing a few special examples, which he evidently feels are typical of all. He begins by declaring that formations like *faxim*, *ausim*, *empsim*, *negassim*, *prohibessim* are not perfect subjunctives, defending himself by reference to Lübbert's work of 1870. Lübbert did take this position, but he was no comparative philologist—not even in his own day—half a century ago. Today, I think, no person recognized as entitled to speak with authority denies that these formations are just as much

perfect subjunctives as *fuërim*, *dixerim*, *ceperim*. So far as I can see, both types of formation are used in Plautus in precisely the same sense, and that sense is a true potential, e.g., *Poen.* 1091, *male faxim lubens*, I render this, "I would gladly injure him"; Kroll renders it, "Ich möchte ihm Übles tun," and adds that "es zeigt unverkennbare voluntative" value. He uses "voluntative" to cover both volitive and optative uses, just as he identifies the two uses themselves. But it isn't the *faxim* that means "Ich möchte tun," it is the *faxim lubens* together. If *faxim* is a voluntative use—using the word in the same sense in which Kroll employs it—then *faxim lubens* would mean "I should like to do him an injury gladly"—a patent absurdity. His interpretation of *Aul.* 494, *ego faxim muli sint viliores Gallicis cantheriis*, is either "Ich möchte bewirken" or "Ich werde bewirken." *Trin.* 221, *pauci sint faxim qui sciunt quod nesciunt*, he asserts, can mean only, "Ich werde bewirken." *M.G.* 316, *non ego tuam empsim vitam vitiosa nuce*, is, "Ich möchte nicht eine taube Nuss für dein Leben geben"; while *Asin.* 503, *haud negassim*, is, "Ich mag es nicht leugnen." Note here that "mag" is equivalent to "kann," so that Kroll here adds a new type of potential to those already recognized. For myself, I feel that in all these cases the "should-would" potential meets every demand of the sense and that nothing else does. All the *faxim*'s mean "I would bring it about," "I'd warrant that"; the *empsim* means "I wouldn't give (a rotten nut for your life)"; the *haud negassim*, "I should not deny"; and similarly with the 30 other instances recorded for the early period, including such examples as *And.* 203, *ubivis facilius passus sim quam in hac re me deludier*; *Ad.* 443, *haud cito mali quid ortum ex hoc sit*; *M.G.* 11, *haud ausit dicere*. To abandon the ordinary potential interpretation in these seems to me to reject the easy and natural in favor of the difficult and artificial.

Kroll does not discuss the eight instances of the pluperfect subjunctive in Early Latin. He seems to me disingenuous in ignoring them. Examples are *Stich.* 590, *haud maligne vos invitassem*; *Eun.* 667, *illum conclusissem neque commissem ut*, etc.; *Ad.* 397, *non olfecissem*?

Kroll's last type of usages embraces conditional sentences. Here, if anywhere, one would say that Kroll's irresponsible methods would



find the path closed. In a sentence like *si sciat, suscenseat*, or *si plus perdiderim, minus aegre habeam*, or *si id esset mihi, pollicerer*, the potential character is so clear that it seems impossible to deny it. Most persons go farther, of course. For most persons believe that the simple sentence is earlier than the compound, and hold that the potential use found in the apodosis of conditional sentences existed in independent uses unaccompanied by any protasis. It is interesting to note how Kroll meets the difficulty in dealing with these subjunctive apodoses. The apodosis, he says, is simply attracted to the mood of the protasis—another instance of the main verb being attracted to the subordinate. When once attracted to the subjunctive protasis, the subjunctive apodosis does, according to Kroll, become *potential*, and he expresses himself as content to allow the name "potential" to be given to subjunctive apodoses provided no claim is made that the subjunctive *naturally* had this value in apodoses. In other words, the Latin language, according to Kroll, did not naturally possess the mechanism for expressing the potential idea in the apodoses of conditional sentences. It evolved that mechanism by two steps: (1) by formal attraction of the mood of the apodosis to the mood of the protasis; (2) by *arbitrarily* attaching to this formally attracted subjunctive the meaning required.

In other words, the Romans had the idea, but not the means, of expressing it. This is a novel theory as to language, and especially would it be strange if the Romans lacked a means of indicating an idea so universally prevalent among civilized peoples as that represented by the "should-would" potential.

I repeat that no such attraction as is assumed by Kroll is known to us elsewhere in Latin or Greek. Nor do I know of its occurrence in any modern language. It seems unnatural. If we find the subjunctive in the apodosis of a conditional sentence, we naturally expect it to possess some function characteristic of the use of the subjunctive elsewhere in independent sentences. In other words, the function appearing in a subjunctive apodosis in Latin may fairly be taken as representing a normal and legitimate function of the subjunctive mood. Moreover, we have subjunctive apodoses from the earliest period combined with indicative protases, e.g., *Aul.* 747, *si istuc jus est, luci deripiamus*; *Rud.* 744, *tanta esset, si vivit*; and

elsewhere. Kroll conveniently ignores these. But they are fatal obstacles to his views, unless they be explained as analogical extensions and historically posterior to the type *si venias, videas*.

Kroll's theory can hardly be called illuminating. He solves no problems. Nothing is made clearer; nothing is made easier. Instead he does violence to the language by the forced interpretation he puts on scores of passages—interpretations adopted for the sole purpose of maintaining his theory that the Latin subjunctive is solely "voluntative" and future. Besides this violence of interpretation—a violence which involves departure from the traditional interpretation of centuries—Kroll is guilty also of much arbitrariness, as exemplified by his identification of the "wish" use with the jussive, while his theory of attraction in his discussion of *velim, nolim, malim*, and, later, of the apodoses of conditional sentences, is positively fantastic, involving among other things highly improbable sequences of historical development. In the case of *velim, nolim, malim*, it involves the employment of these with the subjunctive before they were employed in any other way. In the case of the apodoses of conditional sentences it involves a use in compound sentences which Kroll denies for simple sentences.

Lastly, Kroll's whole theory is gratuitous. It is unnecessary. Why should we hesitate to recognize "wish" uses and potential uses in Latin and to recognize them as a legacy of the Indo-European optative? The optative is there, clearly manifest by its morphology. What possible reason there can be for refusing to believe that it brought with it functions vindicated for Indo-European by Sanskrit, Iranian, Greek, and Germanic, is obscure to me. This reluctance is particularly strange in the case of the perfect subjunctive, where the Indo-European optative forms naturally exhibit the "wish" and potential meanings. Plautus and Terence show some 35 instances of the potential use of the perfect, and at least 50 of the "wish" use.

Kroll is also repeatedly guilty of a strange error in his understanding of what is meant by the optative use. It is bad enough for him to identify the true optative or "wish" use with the volitive or "will" use, as exemplified by the hortatory and jussive. But he goes farther and confuses the "wish" use with the function of

desiderative verbs. He has no compunctions about interpreting *eam* as "Ich möchte gehen," and calling it voluntative (or optative). But that is not a voluntative or optative use; it is desiderative. If *eam* meant "Ich möchte gehen," *eas* would mean "Du möchtest gehen," and *eat*, "Er möchte gehen"; as a voluntative *eam* could mean only, "May I go"; *eas* only, "May you go," etc. Kroll's error is not new; it has often been pointed out.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

## BEATI POSSIDENTES ITHAKISTAE

BY A. SHEWAN

The question here proposed is: On whom does the burden of proof lie in the Leukas-Ithaka dispute?

In attempting an answer I am forced to introduce what Professor Platt once described as that "accursed Homeric Question," for I go back to the *Catalogue of the Ships*, a document which is by some Ithakists and most Leukadists rejected as an addition to the *Iliad*. It is admitted by Dörpfeld himself and his supporters generally that in the *Catalogue* Ithaka is Thiaki, but then they say that the *Catalogue* is late. That has not been proved. Dr. Leaf's great attack on it, splendidly misdescribed, as it seems to me, in *JHS*, XXXVI, 103, as "an extraordinary masterpiece of destructive criticism," has not taken us any farther. I have given reasons for this belief and shall have more to urge. Briefly, his case, so far as it is new, is three-fold, based on alleged malfeasance by the "Cataloguer" with regard to the dominions of Odysseus, Agamemnon, and Peleus.<sup>1</sup> For the first Dr. Leaf requires the Leukas-Ithaka hypothesis, and few will grant him that this has been established. For the second he requires that Mycenaean Corinth should disappear. This involves (1) the arbitrary and unconscionable excision of a passage from the *Iliad*, (2) that Mycenaean remains not only have not yet been, but never can be, found at Corinth,<sup>2</sup> and (3) that there was no intercourse between Greece and the West in Mycenaean days. None of these things can be conceded. As to the dominion of Peleus, see *CR*, XXX, 184 ff. The attack is at this point extremely feeble. It would be difficult, in these better days for Homeric criticism, to find a parallel to the boldness of that repeated "of course" on p. 116 of *Homer and History*.

This being so, we may adhere to the position, established in supersession of the old Niesian doctrine by Mr. Allen in a series of

<sup>1</sup> I might add his rejection of the Assembly at Aulis. On that point see *CR*, XXX, 17 ff.

<sup>2</sup> As to this confident prophecy see, besides the reference in *CR*, XXX, 81, Mr. Allinson in *Am. Jour. Phil.*, 1916, p. 214.



learned and exhaustive papers, and wonderfully confirmed by Mr. M. S. Thompson's demonstration of the correspondence of the contents of the *Catalogue* with the Mycenaean world, that the document is pre-Dorian. To that early world the island we know today as Thiaki was known as Ithaka, and this name<sup>1</sup> has clung to it ever since, except possibly during, and in spite of, short periods in the Middle Ages when the island was deserted. There is no ground in history or tradition for believing that it ever had any other name. It is confirmed by allusions in classical writers, to whom *Leukas* was *Leukas*, and coins and inscriptions are said to agree. And the island was believed by antiquity to be the Homeric Ithaka, and the home of its greatest hero. On that point also there is no trace in history or tradition of any other belief or of any doubt, and especially there is no hint of a Leukadian Odysseus. All this has been repeatedly affirmed in the course of the controversy, and I have not seen it questioned. If grounds for questioning it exist, let them be stated. Dörpfeld's own words on the point are, "For nearly three millennia Thiaki passed for the home of Odysseus and for the Ithaka of Homer. Neither in antiquity nor at the present day has this title of honour been seriously disputed."

The only doubt has been as to the extent of the poet's acquaintance with the island. The terms in which he describes its position in the sea and relatively to other land (though no worse,<sup>2</sup> it is said, than Caesar's in regard to Britain), and the positions of certain places in or near it, have given rise to different opinions. Some—as *le grand hérésiarque* Hercher, who spent one day in Thiaki, confining himself to the limited central portion; who was, as Menge has shown, a very inaccurate observer; and whose *Phantasieinsel* has been rejected even by the Leukadists<sup>3</sup>—have gone so far as to deny that the poet had any personal knowledge of the island, but these extremists are a small minority. Others have reconciled to their own satisfaction

<sup>1</sup> The only attempt, apparently, to explain the name makes it Semitic, = *l-rōkē* = *Utica* = *colonia*. Compare Olshausen in *Rhein. Mus.*, N.F., VIII, 329, note. The island would be a Phoenician settlement. In that connection one recalls Gladstone's paper on "The Phoenician Affinities of Ithaca" (*Nineteenth Century*, August, 1889).

<sup>2</sup> I might now say, "not nearly so bad as." For since this paper was complete I have read what Professor Merrill says in *CJ*, XII, 88 ff.

<sup>3</sup> He treated Troy from the same standpoint, and who regards his views now?

the discrepancies which have been discovered—here as everywhere else in the poems—and have found the whole account consistent. Others, again, are indifferent to the apparent discrepancies, and that for three reasons: first, there is a mass of agreement between the poet's account and actuality that far outweighs the *μικρὰς ἀνομοιότητας*, and, as Professor Jevons has remarked in another connection, the agreement has to be accounted for as well as the difference. Homer and the tradition are confirmed *inter alia* by such broad features as the mountains, the ports, the agricultural regions, and the names Thiaki, Polis, Asteria, Zanté, Samé, Leukas Petré, and even Koraka, Platythria, and Polyktorion. Secondly, they recognize, as even Hercher and some Leukadists do, the old epic poet's right to take some freedom with topography for the purposes of the action of the poem, and decline to demand from him the consistency and exactitude due from a modern historian or surveyor. They think that Causer strikes the *via media* when he says that it is "as wrong to regard all as pure invention as to hold all real and historical." He who objects to such latitude and requires exact correspondence of *Dichtung und Wahrheit* must do so in the face of the extraordinary liberties and inaccuracies which have been discovered in poems and stories of all ages. Lilienstern asks if a good knowledge of the geography of the Scottish Highlands is to be obtained from Scott's romances. I cannot say, but I recall the fact that the novelist does on one occasion, though not certainly as a regular practice, make the sun set in the sea to the east of Scotland. Such an objector must, to confine ourselves to Homer, give up Hissarlik, for there are points in the description of Ilios in the *Iliad* which make the identification impossible. And, thirdly, the changes that three thousand years may have wrought in the terrain are not to be neglected. A mountainous island, forest-clad and with abundant rainfall, will of course be well watered, but it is absurd to expect it to be *wasserreich* and still *βουβόρος*<sup>1</sup> when the slopes have been denuded of all means of water storage. Milk and honey will be scarce there as in many other parts of the earth that have suffered from human folly. In three thousand

<sup>1</sup> Bérard's (unmetrical?) amendment *εὐβόρος* is not required. Anyone who has had experience of cattle in hill forests knows they can thrive there. For one thing, they do not live by grass alone.

years Arethusa might degenerate into a "dirty pool" (though five hundred head of cattle are watered at it daily even now in summer), and bees might be allowed to change their quarters without severe remark. Hissarlik is Ilios though Scamander has changed his bed and a hot spring has vanished like the Ithakan bees.

But all this is beside the immediate point, which is that through and in spite of all the discussions and their different results, one thing has remained unaffected, the traditional belief that the island which has so long borne the name of Ithaka is the one that was to Homer the seat of Odysseus. Here, one would think, is a good basis in tradition; here we have surely *vox totius antiquitatis*, and here *historia loquitur*. These are the phrases used by Wolf to describe the tradition about Pisistratus and Homer, a tradition which cannot be taken beyond the age of Cicero. Yet, comparatively recent as it is, it has been accepted by many minds without hesitation in favor of a German theory. But when a vastly older and stronger tradition tells *against* another German theory, ah, *c'est différent*. And yet in these latter days the respect paid to tradition has greatly increased. Mere isolated stories or scraps of gossip have real value for inquirers. The story of the fountain Hypereia is about the only matter worth regarding in Dr. Leaf's reconstitution of the dominion of Peleus. An Odyssean theory is much helped by the tale in Pausanias about the outcast wanton, Penelope. Instances might be multiplied indefinitely. *Das gute Recht der Tradition* is more generally recognized than formerly, though certainly it is still abused.

We are now to reject this ancient tradition and accept Leukas as Homer's Ithaka. It cannot be; the difficulties are too great. I am not going to write another account of the controversy, but merely to do for Leukas what Dr. Leaf has done on a very small scale for Thiaki. I shall confine myself to enumerating—it must be with inconvenient brevity—the chief points of objection to Dörpfeld's theory. They are, of course, nearly all collected from the literature of the subject. Some are fatal, some are not of great weight, but all point to one conclusion.

1. Leukas is too big to be the Homeric Ithaka, which supplies only twelve ships for Troy (and this, be it observed, not according to the unscrupulous "Cataloguer" only) and twelve woers. Its whole

population (πάντες λαοί) could hardly have been settled in "one city" by the accommodating Menelaos (δ 176).

2. Easy communication with the mainland is one of Dörpfeld's strong points. Yet no wooers are attracted thence.

3. The Homeric epithets do not suit. Leukas would be badly described as ἀμφιάλος.<sup>1</sup> It could not be said to be not εὔρεϊα. To say it is "above all the islands" not ἱππῆλατος and without δρόμος or λειμών is absurd. Epithets of the τρηχεῖα type are not appropriate, while they admittedly fit Thiaki perfectly. Negatively, the absence of reference to the great white cliffs of Leukas is passing strange.

4. ἀμφὶ δὲ νῆσοι κ.τ.λ. does not apply, whichever meaning we give the adverb, for Leukas has no island to the north or the west.

5. μετόπισθε in ν 241 appears to mean "westwards" (Monro) or, more accurately perhaps, "to the northwest." Was Athené referring to Italy? There is no other land west or northwest of Leukas.

6. The Λευκὰς Πέτρη of ω 11, now held by most authorities, Dörpfeld included, to be Cape Dukato, in Leukas, cannot, as his supporter Reissinger admits, be in Homer's Ithaka.

7. The sun rises to Homer's Ithaka "from the streams of Ocean." The expression does not suit Leukas, which lies west of an inclosed bay.

8. If χθαμαλή in its ordinary sense be difficult of Thiaki, it is impossible of Leukas. Michael has shown that Dörpfeld's conclusion based on κ 194 ff. is absolutely untenable.

9. πανπερτάτη, the Leukadists' claim, must be taken as "farthest up in the sea of all." But that cannot be regarded as certain on an examination of the Homeric uses of πᾶς, simple and compounded. "Very far up in the sea" may be the meaning.<sup>2</sup> But let them translate as they desire. They are in no way advantaged. The sentence in which the word occurs runs:

αὐτὴ δὲ χθαμαλή πανπερτάτη εἰν ἀλλ' αἰεὶ  
πρὸς ζόφον, αἱ δὲ τ' ἀνευθε πρὸς ἥῳ τ' ἡέλιόν τε.

<sup>1</sup> If the special meaning of the word, based by Michael and others on its application to Lemnos and Corinth, be accepted, the argument is much stronger.

<sup>2</sup> The only authority, so far as I can discover, who makes this point is Gandar in his excellent *De Ulyssis Ithaca* (Paris, 1854), pp. 11 f., and note. He notices there the πολλὰ of ι 23. The Homeric uses of πολλός correspond in variety to those of πᾶς. There is nothing to be found about these in the books, I think.



The "all" the Leukadists insist on is described by this sentence, and is Ithaka plus a number of islands east of it, and the sentence says Ithaka is farthest up of this group of islands *πρὸς ζόφον*, and that suits Thiaki as well as Leukas. So whether the whole passage describing Ithaka was badly written originally, or whether it has been doctored since, or whether only the line *Δουλίχιόν τε Σάμη τε καὶ Ὀλίγησσα Ζάκυνθος* (which recurs three times) has been inserted by someone who thought the three islands named were those referred to by *πολλαί*, matters not a jot. *πανπερτάτη* is defined by the sentence in which it occurs, and fits Thiaki admirably.

10. *ἀνευθε*, used of the "many islands," must mean "at a distance." It cannot mean merely "apart," "separate," for any island can be so described. The word thus does not apply to Leukas, while it suits Thiaki perfectly.

11. The distance from what is now known to be the Homeric Pylos to Leukas is nearly half as great again as the distance from Pylos to the *πρώτη ἀκτὴ* of Thiaki at S. Andrea, and is an impossible trip for a Homeric ship in one night. We know how fatal an hour or a mile is to the topography of Thiaki.

12. Dörpfeld argues that the ferrying of flocks and herds for pasture to the mainland from Thiaki is unthinkable. As a matter of fact they are regularly ferried over in large numbers at the present day, and the Archduke Ludwig Salvator asserts that such ferrying is extremely common in the Greek islands and in Dalmatia. It is nowhere stated in the *Odyssey*, as some assume, that supplies were ferried across *daily*.

13. Why should Noemon or anyone else take horses or cattle out of Leukas with its square miles of pasture, which at the present day support a thousand horses, not to mention cattle? But, if it was necessary, was there no pasture to be had inland from Leukas? Was the best resource a sixty-mile journey by sea to Elis?

14. Antinoos threatens to cast Iros "into a black ship and send him to the mainland." Is the contemplated voyage simply the short trip in the ferry?

15. Dörpfeld has to force the remark, *οὐ μὲν γάρ τί σε πεζὸν οἶομαι ἐνθάδ' ἰκέσθαι*, in a question to a newcomer, out of the meaning universally given to it. Paulatos quotes similar small jokes in exactly the

same circumstances as current at the present day, and others give parallels in German. The acme of absurdity is surely reached when it is suggested by Goessler that a man who comes by a ferry can be said to come on foot, because "a ferry is the primitive substitute for a bridge!"

The first part of the question, as to the ship and sailors that brought the newcomer, shows that the alternative of a ferry was not present to the questioner's mind.

The remark itself should be interpreted with reference to λ 158 f., where Odysseus' mother tells him that the stream of Ocean is not to be crossed on foot; you must have a ship.

16. In δ 635 the word used for a trip to Elis is *διαβήμεναι*. The uses of this verb suggest that it is used more appropriately of the open stretch between Thiaki and Elis than of the partly island-strewn sea between Leukas and Elis.

17. In ν 274 ff. a ship making for Pylos or Elis is driven by a storm to a haven in Ithaka. Is Thiaki, or Leukas, much farther to the north, the more likely to be meant?

18. The soi-disant beggar tells that Odysseus is in Thesprotia, which adjoins Leukas. The reception of the news is hardly what one would expect if the long-lost hero were only a few miles away with no sea to speak of between.

19. The port of Ithaka is *πολυβενθής*, which has hitherto meant to commentators, "with very deep water." So for Chrysé (Leaf's *Troy*, pp. 223 ff.). The port selected in Leukas has shallow water, so *λιμὴν πολυβενθής* is to mean in future *ein tief sich ins Land erstreckender* (or *hineinspringender*, Rüter) *Hafen!*

20. Similarly *ἐκὰς νήσων* has been expanded into *Zwischen den Inseln durch, aber fern von ihnen*. This was when Telemachus' return by a route west of Cefalonia—as actually propounded at first by Dörpfeld and still maintained by his henchman Goessler—was seen to be absurd. The difficulty was cleared by excision in the early part of ο. Reproached with this, Dörpfeld replied that *he* did not make away with the passage, he only used the athetesis of others. No *animus furandi* there! For Dr. Leaf's entirely new interpretation of *ἐκὰς νήσων*, see *CR*, XXX, 82.

21. The Homeric Asteris is now said to be Arkoudi, an island northeast of the northern prong of Thiaki. Let anyone look at a

good official map, such as that on p. 419 of Bérard's second volume or Murray's Handy Map, and say if Arkoudi can be said to be "*in a strait*" between Thiaki and Leukas. The description is quite impossible. The so-called strait is surely the only strait in existence that is actually broader than it is long!

22. This has led to strange wobbling—*Zikzakpolitik* the Germans call it—with regard to the meaning of *πορθμός*. See *JHS*, XXXIV, 231 f. It is more than wobbling; it is the wriggling of a worm impaled.

23. However we may render *λιμένες ἀμφίδυμοι*, Arkoudi cannot show them. Professor Manly settled that. The spit of land does not form "havens."

24. Dörpfeld would now bring Telemachus past Arkoudi to his certain destruction, and this whether the young man was making for Vasiliki (Dörpfeld's first choice, abandoned when it was seen that it could not be described as *Ἰθάκης πρώτη ἀκτὴ*), or Skydi (his second), or Syvota (his supporter Gallina's). Athené must have been tempting Telemachus to his undoing, as she once did Hector. But this will no doubt be explained as the result of the incorporation of a parallel version by a "faker" or "harmonizer."

25. A ship going to Thiaki from Thesprotia (§ 339) would sail far from land; one bound for Leukas would sail down the coast.

26. There is admittedly no evidence that Leukas was ever known as Ithaka. Proof, it will be said, is impossible. That may be the misfortune and not the fault of the Leukadists, but all the same it is eternally fatal. Dörpfeld cannot, a Quarterly Reviewer says, "get over the difficulty that the name of Leukas was Leukas and the name of Ithaka was Ithaka." The Corinthians, when occupying Leukas, did not apparently recall the old name or the glorious connection with the most famous hero in the Greek tradition. Often as Thucydides mentions Leukas, there is no hint of a splendid heroic past.

27. And there is not, admittedly, any evidence of a Dorian thrust to account for the ejection of the people of Leukas (then Ithaka) into Thiaki (then Samé). It is a mere guess to provide an essential link. *Vielleicht von den Dorern vertrieben*, Dörpfeld says, and so the change of name *erklärt sich sehr einfach*. Very simply indeed, by arbitrarily adding to the tradition to help out a hypothesis, instead of basing

one's hypothesis on the tradition we have. It does simplify matters to assume *Völker*-, *Namen*-, and *Sagenverschiebungen* as one requires them. Well may Engel ask, "Is such a method of proof permissible to a scientific authority?"

28. We are to suppose that the fugitives overpowered the folk of Thiaki (Samé) and gave their country's name (Ithaka) to it, and that its people in turn transferred themselves and their island's name (Samé) to the far larger island of Cefalonia (then Doulichion), which they, though certainly *παῦροι κεκακωμένοι*, were able to conquer. It is assumption on assumption. Was ever such a "General Post" assumed in order to complete a hypothesis?

29. And it involves real difficulty. The original Ithakans, dispossessed of the large and fertile Leukas, are content to settle in the far smaller and, by comparison, barren and unattractive Thiaki, and only a few miles from their Dorian enemies. Yet farther away was Zakynthus, which, as Mr. Hogarth tells us, "for native riches bears the palm." They could not have known of it, or it had not yet been upheaved from the depths.

30. The swampy ground of Nidri, where Dörpfeld places the capital of Ithaka, is said to be the worst site possible for a royal seat. The ancient burg—outside Crete—was usually on a height. The remains discovered suggest to Engel the establishment of a pre-Mycenaean horse breeder, who would be in his element there, like his confrères of the marshes of the Argolic Plain.

31. The capital of the Homeric Ithaka was evidently close to the sea, and not so far from it as Nidri is.

32. In the end of  $\beta$  and in  $\delta$  780 ff. a ship leaves the port of Ithaka. If that was Vlichos, we should expect to hear that she first went north up the two or three miles of the Vlichos inlet before turning south on what was certainly a nasty bit of navigation by night through a group of islands. There is nothing of the sort, and *στῆσε δ' ἐπ' ἐσχατιῇ λιμένος* ( $\beta$  391) cannot be forced to serve as a substitute for it.

33. Rheithron is still sadly to seek in the Leukadist scheme.

34. It does not appear that Dörpfeld has ever tried to *prove* that the Homeric descriptions fit the localities in Leukas. He simply says, "I put the capital here and Eumaeus there," and so on, and is then

*functus officio*. But his *Zikzakpolitik* here, as exhibited by Gustav Lang, is remarkable, and Engel, after visiting and traversing Leukas, declares that "not a single feature of the Homeric descriptions of Ithaka corresponds with Leukadian actuality."

35. And finally, the supporters of the new theory have to assume that parts of the poems, such as the *Catalogue*, the "Continuation" of the *Odyssey*, and the *Telemachy*, have been proved to be late and negligible, just as argument requires, and are far from agreeing among themselves. The procedure facilitates the elaboration of hypotheses, but also renders them abortive.

To Dörpfeld "Homer is a realist," and the poems display "descriptions of actuality in every sphere," descriptions depending on a "sure knowledge of localities." How then, in face of the difficulties enumerated above, can he say that Homer was describing Leukas? We cannot, for such a bundle of contradictions, impossibilities, and evasions, bound together only by his "I know and I can prove it"—the sophist's *διέσκεμμαι πάλοι*—give up the tradition of three thousand years. But for his pertinacity and the facts that the hypothesis pertains to the Homeric sphere, in which anyone may do all that does not become a man, it would have been laughed out of court long ago. It has obtained some support, but far greater reasoned opposition, and as Beloch says, *steht vollständig in der Luft*.

The Leukadist's reply is a *tu quoque*. The Ithakist, he says, admits difficulties in his own case, which he seeks to brush aside, as he cannot cure them, by deprecating a too rigid interpretation of the incidents in an epic narrative. The Ithakist must allow liberties with regard to Leukas, if they are to be claimed for Thiaki.

That is a fair reply. What then should be the next step? I venture to suggest one. The course which the Ithakan controversy has pursued during the last hundred years has for several reasons been unsatisfactory. I will not lengthen this paper by describing these reasons here. I will only say that in the literature of the subject there is now one serious need, and that is of a comprehensive up-to-date statement of the weaknesses of the Thiaki case. We want it in English. We have it in German in Hercher's treatise, but that was written just fifty years ago, and his arguments have been demolished over and over again by set replies in his own country. The

thing requires to be done afresh. It has recently been said that not a single Ithakan site described in the *Odyssey* can be identified. A justification in detail of that assertion will help to a solution by giving us the desiderated statement of the infirmities of the Thiaki case. Those who are interested will then be in a better position to compare the opposing beliefs. Of the possible result of the comparison I will at this stage merely say this, that, if it leaves only an equality of difficulty, the tradition will stand, sufficient in itself, on the side of Thiaki. I adhere to Professor Manly's view that, "until some better claimant than either [Thiaki or Leukas] is produced, the traditional view, unbroken through recorded history, must be maintained." Till then, *beati possidentes Ithakistae*. They need no new hypothesis. The tradition is enough, and the burden is heavy on him who would subvert it.

ST. ANDREWS



## REFERENCES TO PAINTING IN PLAUTUS AND TERENCE

BY CHARLES KNAPP

As the starting-point of this paper I have selected the famous *cave canem* passage in *Mo.* 832-52, which I have already twice discussed in print,<sup>1</sup> though less fully than in the present article.

Theopropides has but lately returned from a long trading-voyage (431). He finds the front door of his house closed and locked in the daytime (444;<sup>2</sup> explained by 404, 425-26). Before he has time to wonder much at this, Tranio, his slave, appears (446) and tells Theopropides that, since ghosts had begun to walk in their one-time home, Philolaches, Theopropides' son, had been obliged to move and to buy a house elsewhere (454 ff., especially 479 ff.). Pressed to tell whose house had been bought, Tranio, using the first lie that comes to mind, declares that Philolaches has bought the house of Simo, neighbor of Theopropides (659 ff.). Theopropides then wishes to inspect the new house in detail, without and within (674 ff.). He sends Tranio to ask permission of Simo to make such inspection (683 ff.). Simo presently appears (690), and after a long soliloquy (690-710), and a talk with Tranio (711-74), meets Theopropides (805), and bids him go where he will in his (Simo's) house (809).

After Theopropides has carefully examined the *vestibulum*, the *ambulacrum*, and the *postes* (817-31), the following dialogue ensues (832 ff.):<sup>3</sup>

*Tr.* Viden *pictum* ubi ludificat una cornix volturios duos?

*Th.* Non edepol video. *Tr.* At ego video, nam inter volturios duos cornix astat: ea volturios duo vicissim vellicat.

Quaeso huc ad me specta cornicem ut conspiciere possies.

Iam vides? *Th.* Profecto nullam equidem illic cornicem intuo.

<sup>1</sup> See the *Classical Review*, XX, 395 ff.; the *Latin Leaflet*, No. 136, January 8, 1906.

<sup>2</sup> In a Princeton University dissertation, entitled *The House-Door on the Ancient Stage* (Baltimore, 1914), pp. 12-14, Mr. W. W. Mooney holds that the house-door on the Roman stage was kept closed during the day (as in actual life), and that in *Mo.* 444; *Am.* 1018; and *Stich.* 308, surprise is expressed, "not because the door is shut [in the daytime], but because it is locked" (p. 13).

<sup>3</sup> Unless otherwise stated, I give Lindsay's text; the punctuation and capitalization are my own.

*Tr.* At tu isto ad vos optuere, quoniam cornicem nequis  
conspicari, si volturios forte possis contui.

*Th.* Omnino, ut te apsolvam, *nullam pictam* conspicio hic avem.

Here, plainly, we have reference to painting in somewhat elaborate form, a representation of a raven assailing two vultures. Where are we to locate this painting? If anywhere at all, on the *outside* of the house. In 817-28 Theopropides and Tranio were examining the *vestibulum*, the *ambulacrum*, and the *postes*; in 829-31 they were looking at *coagmenta in foribus*. They do not enter the house till 858. They then remain within till 904.

We need to remember, however, that the *Mostellaria* is in many respects a veritable extravaganza, a lively and energetic, but, at times, wholly improbable, farce, in places difficult, I should say, of representation in any age, unless no regard is paid to verisimilitude of illusion.<sup>1</sup>

The spirit of riotous burlesque is especially marked in the whole passage under review and in the description of the house in general. Cf. particularly 907-14, where Theopropides and Tranio, having come forth from Simo's house, talk enthusiastically of what they have seen

<sup>1</sup> For example, in 682 Tranio is sent to interview Simo, to get permission for Theopropides to inspect Simo's house. For 100 verses Theopropides stands about doing nothing; Tranio indeed seems to be out of his sight, for at 721a he calls out to Tranio to return, and at 784, when Tranio at last does return and address his master, the latter exclaims, "Hem, quis hic nominat me?" Again, in 785, he asks, "Unde is?" Tranio's question to Simo in 774, "Eon, voco huc hominem," though not in itself significant, seems in this context to indicate that Simo and Tranio had not been in sight of Theopropides. Professor Fay seems to think that at 687 Tranio stepped into the alley (*angiportum*) to call on Simo, by a side door (see his note on 785). But was it usual to call on gentlemen via the side door? Yet how else could Tranio have been out of his master's sight? In the *Trinummus*, to be sure, Lesbianus adulescens lives in a *posticulum*, which *recepit, quom aedis vendidit* (*Trin.* 194) in his father's absence. To this he gained access, no doubt, through an *angiportum* (though no mention is made of an *angiportum* in the play). But the situation in the *Trinummus* is unique in Roman comedy. Professor Sonnenschein (2d ed., 1907) makes Tranio step into the *angiportum* at 687 and Simo "enter . . . , from his house at the back of the stage" (see his notes on 687, 689), but he says nothing at all of the place of the actual conference between the two, or of the difficulties raised in the earlier part of this note. Professor Morris, in his edition (1886), p. 124, made the meeting take place in front of Simo's house. If the two really met before Simo's front door, to answer the difficulties raised above we shall have to fall back on the great breadth of the Roman stage, though this ever-ready crutch seems none too good a support here. Such questions as these, however, Plautus probably did not ask himself nor did his audience ask them of him.

within. Note that the most extravagant idea of the whole passage (909)<sup>1</sup> is suggested by Theopropides senex himself.

In view of all this we need not trouble ourselves because decoration of the exterior walls of private houses representing definite and elaborate scenes appears not to have been common at any time, either at Athens or at Pompeii, or, we may infer, at Rome itself, particularly at the time of the production of the *Mostellaria*.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Tr. Quoiusmodi gynaeceum? quid porticum? Th. Insanum bonam. Non equidem ullam in publico esse maiorem hac existumo.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Stevens, in Fowler-Wheeler, *Greek Archaeology*, p. 189, is, by his silence, against such decoration of Greek private houses. Nor do I find evidence of it in the following discussions of the Greek and the Roman house: Smith, *Dictionary of Antiquities*, I, 659 B, 660 A, 664 B, 666-67; II, 345 B-347 A; Mau-Kelsey, *Pompeii: Its Life and Art*, p. 456; Baumeister, I, 627 B; Gereke-Norden, *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft* (1913), II, 27; the article "Römisches Haus," by Fiechter, in Pauly-Wissowa, *Zweite Reihe, Erste Halbband* (1914); the article "Haus," in Fr. Lübker, *Reallexikon des klassischen Altertums* (1914). In Mau-Kelsey, p. 456, the following statement appears: "Previous to the time of Augustus the stucco coating of outer walls ordinarily remained uncolored. Afterwards color was employed, but only to a limited extent, as in the addition of a dark base to a wall the rest of which remained white." Bertha Carr Rider, *The Greek House: Its History and Development from the Neolithic Period to the Hellenistic Age* (1916), is not concerned at all with the decoration of houses. H. R. Hall, *Aegean Archaeology* (1915), pp. 178-98, throws no light on our problem.

External decoration of public buildings was of course not unknown; cf. e.g., the decorations in the Stoa, by Polygnotus. Athenian spectators, familiar with these decorations, would have no difficulty in catching the idea which the author in Plautus' original wished them to grasp at the point corresponding to *Mo.* 832 ff. The phrase "ullam in publico . . . maiorem (porticum)" in *Mo.* 909, in view of the whole context since 832, inevitably makes one think of paintings like those in the Stoa at Athens; it should be carefully noted, however, that the porticus in Plautus' description (908) is within doors, and that nothing is said of paintings in that porticus.

Mr. J. J. Robinson, of the Hotchkiss School, has been kind enough to call my attention to a passage in the *Digest*, Pompon. D. I. 15. 1. Pomponius, speaking of *servitutes*, i.e., restricting rights or burdens which lie against property, says: "Servitutum non ea natura est ut aliquid faciat quis, veluti viridia tollat aut amoeniorem prospectum praestet, aut in hoc ut in suo pingat, sed ut aliquid patiat aut non faciat." "the essence of *servitutes* does not lie in the necessity of doing something, for example removing bushes or furnishing a more pleasing view, or painting ['displaying pictures,' says Mr. Robinson] on his own property for the purpose [= making a pleasanter view?], but rather in putting up with something or in refraining from doing something." Mr. Robinson's impression was that this passage bears testimony to the decoration of external walls. In his *Selections from the Public and Private Law of the Romans* (1905), p. 189, Mr. Robinson, in a note on the passage just cited, writes: "In suo pingat refers to the practice of decorating walls or other surfaces with paintings and frescoes for the purpose of beautifying the landscape. This practice is referred to by Juv. *Sat.* 8. 157. Cf. also *Dig.* 43. 17. 3, 9. Such 'coverings' of paint and fresco were called *tectoria*." Now Juvenal 8. 157 has nothing at all to do with paintings on the outside

It might indeed be argued that the very use of this kind of joke by Tranio proves that paintings on the outside of buildings (houses) were not unknown at Rome in Plautus' time. But the argument is not convincing. The passages given below as referring to paintings (portraits) and frescoes (cf. *Men.* 141 ff.; *Merc.* 313 ff.; *Eun.* 584-90) show clearly that the idea of frescoes or paintings *within* houses was to the Roman audience not an impossible or a difficult conception, whether the actual thing was familiar in their experience or not. Given this point, we may say at once that it would be no great strain on the audience to grasp a joke turning on a reference to similar (imaginary) paintings *outside* a house. The joke is surely better if such paintings did not exist at all in actual experience.<sup>1</sup>

of buildings. There Juvenal, writing of Lateranus, the horse-loving consul, says (155-57):

Interea, dum lanatas robumque iuvenum  
more Numae caedit, Iovis ante altaria iurat  
solam Eponam et facies olida ad praesepe pictas.

Here we are not dealing with a house at all. Several editors of Juvenal did not think it worth while to comment on the *facies*; others rightly make them pictures within the stables (so Lewis, Duff, Mayor, Hardy, Simcox, Pearson-Strong). Lewis reminds us that in Apuleius *Met.* 3. 27 (Helm, 1907), when Lucius, transformed into an ass, first goes into the stable, he finds "pilae mediae quae stabuli trabes sustinebat in ipso fere meditullo Eponae deae simulacrum residens aediculae." In reality, in the passage cited above from the *Digest* there is nothing to show whether the paintings referred to were to be on an exterior wall or on an interior wall of a house. In any case, the testimony of the *Digest* would be to a time much later than that of Plautus and Terence.

On a priori grounds, however, we may argue that to a Roman of Plautus' day paintings on the outside of a house were not unthinkable. We may recall, as possibly helpful here, the *graffiti* of various sorts, the caricatures, election notices, etc., that appear so often on walls at Pompeii (see Mau-Kelsey, *Pompeii*, p. 486). In Mau-Kelsey, p. 234, we have reference to a painting of "the Lares, with their offerings," on an exterior street wall above a shrine. It must be confessed, however, that all these things combined fall far short of a definite composition on the exterior of a private house such as our *Mostellaria* passage seems to imply. We come closer to that in the account given in the *American Journal of Archaeology*, Second Series, XVII (1913), 115, of four blocks of stone found at Pompeii, which formed the architrave of a passageway. The blocks were ornamented with paintings of Sol, Jupiter, Mercury, and Luna. See *Notizie degli Scavi*, IX (1912), 102-20. At the sides of the passageway were pilasters, decorated with paintings: one represents a sacred procession, the other a large female figure identified as Venus Pompeiana. See further *Notizie*, IX, 174-92, 216-24, 246-59, 281-89. In the *American Journal of Archaeology*, Second Series, XVII (1913), 114-15, is an account of a shrine at Pompeii, with a painted frieze representing the Dei Consentes or Penates Publici of Pompeii; the frieze is figured on p. 115. In 1914, again, on external pilasters at Pompeii were found fine paintings, one of which represents Aeneas with Ascanius and Anchises, the other a Roman warrior. See *American Journal of Archaeology*, XVIII (1914), 398.

<sup>1</sup> One more argument is possible, that, had paintings on exteriors been unknown, Theopropides would have exhibited far more mystification and surprise at 833 than

But let us return to the passage from which we started. After the verses already quoted there is further by-play, till at last in 849 ff. we have this dialogue:

*Th.* Ibo intro igitur. *Tr.* Mane sis, videam ne canes— *Th.* Agedum vide.  
*Tr.* St! abi, canes! St! abin dierecta? abin hinc in malam cruceem?  
 At etiam restas? St! Abi istine! *Si.* Nil pericli est, age\* \*  
 Tam placidast quam feta quaevis. Eire intro audacter licet.  
 Eo ego hinc ad forum. *Th.* Fecisti commode: bene ambula.  
 Tranio, | age, canem | istanc a foribus abducant face,  
 etsi non metuenda est. *Tr.* Quin tu illam aspice ut placide accubat!  
 nisi molestum vis videri te atque ignavom. *Th.* Iam,<sup>1</sup> ut lubet.  
 Sequere me hac igitur.

I am convinced that Plautus meant his audience to think of the dog in our passage as a *painted* dog, somewhere within the house, let us say on a side wall of the entrance-passage. Of course when the play was acted there need not have been a dog of any kind, painted, mosaic, or stuffed (see below), within the house. Decidedly in favor of the suggestion that Plautus meant his audience to think of a *painted* dog is the elaborate reference made in 832 ff. to painting. One who can imagine the speed with which 832-56 would be acted on the Roman stage will appreciate how impossible it would have been for the spectators to lose the suggestion of paintings conveyed by 832 ff.

If I am right in my theory that Plautus meant his audience to think of a painted dog, then the *cave canem* incident in Petronius 29 is an illuminating parallel.

In his note on *Mo.* 850 (1st ed., 1884) Professor Sonnenschein said: "But perhaps the fun of this passage consisted in having not a real dog, but the figure of a dog represented on the threshold, like that in the house of the Tragic Poet at Pompeii." I have shown above that I had in part reached the same conclusions as Professor

he does. See below, p. 148, the quotation from Mr. Thompson's paper in the *Classical Review* and the comments made thereon. But Theopropides may well enough have shown his surprise by gesture and bearing rather than by words; there is abundant evidence of the vigorous stage-business of the Roman theater, e.g., in the Terentian miniatures and in Quintilian, to go no farther afield. Theopropides is impatient enough even in words at 836, 839. So at 851 Simo's amusement is to be depicted by his acting.

<sup>1</sup> Plautus has got all possible fun out of the situation and at last (*iam*) lets Theopropides wake up.

Sonnenschein—in so far, I mean, as I had concluded that there was no need to think of a real dog. But, in view of *pictum* (832), and *pictam* (839), his suggestion that we are to think of a *mosaic* dog seems to me in itself far less natural and effective than the view I have already urged. Further, there is no (other) passage in Plautus or Terence in which there is reference to mosaic work, and for good reasons. Mosaic work seems not to have been introduced into Greece till the close of the fourth century or the beginning of the third century B.C.: it was not known at Rome till the time of Sulla.<sup>1</sup>

The editor of the *Classical Review*, in a note to my paper (XX, 397), pointed out that in the *Classical Review*, IV, 381, Mr. E. S. Thompson had argued for a stuffed dog. He wrote thus: "That Theopropides should be frightened at the mosaic figure of a dog on the threshold . . . seems rather far-fetched, and it seems strange that no allusion to so absurd a mistake should be made by the other actors." On this argument see above, p. 146, n. 1. Further, for the purposes of this scene a mosaic or a painted dog<sup>2</sup> is no more absurd than a stuffed dog and about equally fear-inspiring. Indeed, absurdity, riotous burlesque, is exactly what we want here, as in 829. Finally, the surprise and amusement of the other actors are clearly enough, if rather subtly, indicated by Plautus (p. 146, n. 1).<sup>3</sup>

One passes with pleasure from these rather minute speculations to consider other passages which refer beyond question to painting—frescoes within a house, and portraits done by the encaustic process.

In *As*. 127 ff. *Argyrippus adulescens*,<sup>4</sup> standing outside the house of *Cleareta Iena*, from which he has just been ejected, voices his

<sup>1</sup> See Mr. Cecil Smith in Smith, *Dictionary of Antiquities*, II, 397; Professor J. R. Wheeler in Fowler-Wheeler, *Greek Archaeology*, p. 538; A. S. Murray in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, II, 367 A; the article "Mosaik," in Lübker, *Reallexikon des klassischen Altertums*, II, 681 (1914).

<sup>2</sup> Encolpius, in Petronius 28, was frightened severely enough by a painted dog!

<sup>3</sup> There is no room here to discuss Professor G. D. Kellogg's intricate explanation of our passage in his paper, "The Painting of the Crow and Two Vultures in Plautus, *Mostellaria*, 832 ff.," in *PAPA*, XLI (1910), xlii-xlv, especially since I cannot accept his view.

<sup>4</sup> I give commonly the rôle played by the speaker, that the reader may see what kinds of personages speak the passages that fall within the scope of this paper. This sort of information may well be important. Long after the present paper had taken form, I noted Professor Abbott's very brief discussion, in his *Society and Politics in*



feelings against the *lena*. The latter appears at 153; the ensuing dialogue culminates, for our purposes, at 173 ff.:

*Arg.* Male agis mecum. *Cl.* Quid me accusas, si facio officium meum?  
nam neque fictum<sup>1</sup> usquamst neque pictum neque scriptum in poematis<sup>2</sup>  
ubi *lena* bene agat cum quiquam amante, quae frugi esse volt.

*Ancient Rome*, pp. 178-79, in which he sought to infer the intellectual interests and capacities of Plautus' audiences by noting what Greek myths appear in his plays. So Professor J. S. Reid, in his edition of the *Academica*, p. 20, uses the allusions to philosophy and philosophical reflections in the fragments of the Roman drama, tragic and comic, as a means of determining the measure of Roman acquaintance with philosophic matters. Strange to say, however, he makes no reference at all in this connection to Plautus.

<sup>1</sup> For another reference to statuary in our poets compare *Cap.* 950-52: "*He. Interibi ego ex hac statua verberea volo erogitare meo minore quid sit factum filio.*" For literal, less figurative expressions see *Ru.* 560, 648, 673, 689 (all four passages refer to a *signum Veneris* which forms part of the stage-setting: the speakers are a *senex*, a *servus*, a young *mulier*, an *ancilla*); *Ba.* 954; *Ps.* 1064 (in one of the last two passages a *servus*, in the other a *senex* refers to the *Palladium*, a bookish reference entirely). Similar to *Cap.* 950-52 is *Ru.* 821 ff., where, after *Daemones senex* has stationed two slaves with clubs to prevent *Labrax leno* from molesting the girls, *Labrax* cries: "*Heu hercle! ne istic fana mutantur cito: iam hoc Herculi fit Veneris fanum quod fuit; ita duo destituit signa hic cum clavis senex.*" See finally *Fragg.* 31-33.

<sup>2</sup> Here, since *poematis* is set in contrast to *pictum* and *fictum*, it must mean "poems," "literary creations," as opposed to the two forms of the plastic art. In *AJP*, XXVI, 4-5, however, Professor Sihler seeks to show that, in *As.* 746 ff.; *Cas.* 860 f.; *Ps.* 401-5, *poeta* does not mean "poet," but rather *scriba*, "a writer in the widest sense." Yet in *As.* and *Cas. loc. cit.*, he also inclines to interpret *poeta* as a kind of shyster lawyer, "a notary or composer of current forms of civil law." He does not allow, however, for the burlesque tone in all these passages. Nor had he any conception of the rôle played in Plautus by literature. In this connection see my paper, "References to Painting and Literature in Plautus and Terence," *PAPA*, XLI (1911), xlvii-lviii.

I feel sure, then, that in *Cas.* 857-61 and *As.* 746-47 *poeta* means "poet," with burlesque or mock-heroic effect ("maker," the Old English word for "poet," or "composer" would serve very well as a rendering; "creator" would even better give the mock-heroic effect). In *Cas.* 860-61, "*nec fallaciam astutiorum ulli fecit poeta atque haec est fabre facta ab nobis*," we may note the repetition of the *facio* root. Thinking of *regum rex regalior*, applied by *Ergasilus parasitus* to himself in *Cap.* 825, we may say that, in the *Casina*, to the mind of *Myrrina ancilla* the deviser of the scheme that so pleases her is *poeta poetarum* (to borrow a form of expression from *Petronius*), "maker of makers," "constructor of constructors," "composer of composers." Even clearer is *Ps.* 394 ff. There *Pseudolus servus* knows not yet how he is to trick his master, yet he is confident that he will succeed in his purpose (401 ff.). There to some extent the etymological force of *poeta* is again in Plautus' mind. Clearer still are *Cur.* 592-93 and *Cap.* 1033.

It is really impossible to divorce Plautus' use of *poeta* from *Naevius'* proud application of the term to himself. May there be in the Plautine passages parody of that application? According to the well-known tradition, the *Metelli* had shown clearly enough in the famous "*Dabunt malum Metelli Naevio poetae*" the way to effective

Akin to *As.* 173 ff. is *Cap.* 998-1000. The ἀναγνώρισις has been accomplished; Tyndarus, sent to the quarries by Hegio at 721 ff., has been recalled, and now, re-entering, speaks thus:

Vidi ego multa saepe picta, quae Accherunti fierent<sup>1</sup>  
cruciamenta, verum enim vero nulla adaeque est Accheruns  
atque ubi ego fui, in lapicidinis.

For the kind of pictures Tyndarus had in mind see Lindsay's excellent note on 998, in his *editio maior* (London, 1900), p. 347.

I pass now to *Merc.* 313 ff. Demipho senex has told his crony Lysimachus how desperately in love he is. This causes Lysimachus to exclaim:

Si umquam vidistis *pictum amatorem*, em illic est.  
Nam meo quidem animo vetulus, decrepitu senex  
tantidemst quasi sit *signum*<sup>2</sup> *pictum*<sup>3</sup> in pariete.

With this passage we may compare one in the *Epidicus*. Stratipocles adulescens, accompanied by his slave Epidicus, is waiting for a danista to bring him a girl he has bought. Note 620 ff.:

use of such parody. For Plautus' interest in contemporary life see *Classical Philology*, II, 13, n. 1; II, 14, n. 1 (last paragraph). Terence, in his *Prologues*, uses *poeta* of the literary artist, seriously of himself, derisively of Luscius Lanuvinus, though the derision is in part in the epithet *vetus*, "antediluvian," "fossilized," in part in the context (cf., e.g., *Haut.* 31 ff.). Other parodic references by Plautus to contemporary Latin writers I shall discuss in a forthcoming paper.

<sup>1</sup> In passing I note that the subjunctive seems to be due to oratio obliqua: "torments which, so they said, were being inflicted." Similar is *raperet* in *Men.* 143, cited below, p. 152. Lindsay's note on the mood here seems to me futile. The note consists merely of references, without comment, to *Men.* 143; *Truc.* 81; *Cic. C.M.* 7, "quorum ego multorum cognovi senectutem sine querella, qui se et libidinum vinculis laxatos esse non moleste ferrent nec a suis despicerentur"; *Or.* 171, "Legi enim audivique nonnullos, quorum propemodum absolute concluderetur oratio." Here is sad confusion, for in *Men.* 143 the subjunctive is in oratio obliqua; in *Cic. C.M.* 7, Reid, no mean authority, makes the subjunctive one of "characteristic": at any rate it is hard to find oratio obliqua here; in *Truc.* 81 the clause may well be final, in spite of Lindsay's note on *Cap.* 1034, perhaps better "characteristic" (potential, some would say, adapted to the past tense of the main verb, "one who would give her more," but it is not oratio obliqua, at least of the sort we have in *Cap.* 998); *Cic. Or.* 171 is like *Cic. C.M.* 7.

<sup>2</sup> For *signum* alone of works of art see Lewis and Short, s.v., C., p. 1698 A, Georges s.v., E.

<sup>3</sup> The epithet *pictum*, in the light of the use of this verb elsewhere in Plautus, shows that in *Epid.* 624 *signum* means "figure," "likeness" in general, not a statue. So, too, do verses 625-26 of the *Epidicus*. Of course, if we must take *signum* as "statue," we may say that the phrase *pictum signum* looked to the practice of painting statues, referred to not for its own sake, but to pave the way for the joke in 625-26; in that case the slave thinks of himself as a *statua* (*verbera*; cf. *Cap.* 951). In *Merc.* 315 *signum pictum* plainly refers to a painting.

- Ep.* Sed quis haec est muliercula et ille gravastellus qui venit?  
*St.* Hic est danista, haec illa est autem quam emi de praeda. *Ep.*  
 Haecinest?  
*St.* Haec est. Estne ita ut tibi dixi? aspecta et contempla, Epidice:  
 usque ab unguiculo ad capillum summumst festivissima.  
 Estne consimilis quasi quom *signum pictum*<sup>1</sup> *pulchrum* aspexeris?  
*Ep.* E tuis verbis meum futurum corium pulchrum praedicas,  
 quem *Apella atque Zeuxis duo pingent pigmentis ulmeis*.<sup>2</sup>

In the *Poenulus* the ἀναγνώσις has been accomplished: Hanno of Carthage has recovered his long-lost daughters. At 1269 all three embrace one another again. At sight of this Agorastocles adulescens, lover of one of the girls, exclaims (1271 ff.):

O Apella, O Zeuxis pictor,  
 cur numero estis mortui, hoc exemplo ut pingeretis?  
 nam alios pictores nil moror huius modi tractare exempla.

"Why, Apelles, why, Zeuxis, prince of painters, why are ye dead before the time? would that you were alive now that ye might paint with this model before you," etc. We may remember with profit that Alexander the Great would have none but Apelles paint his portrait.

In *Stich.* 247 ff. Crocotium, ancilla of Panegyris, bids Gelasimus parasitus come to her mistress at once. In comic fashion, however, they waste much time (250-65). In 266-69 Gelasimus, recalled to the business in hand, wonders why Panegyris matrona desires his presence. At 270 he cries:

Sed ecum Pinacium eiūs puerum. Hoc vide,  
 satin ut facete atque ex pictura adstitit.  
 Ne iste edepol vinum poculo pauxillulo  
 saepe exanclavit submerum scitissume.

<sup>1</sup> See footnote 3, p. 150.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *As.* 548 ff.: "We are sturdy fellows, we slaves; we play our parts manfully," "adversum stimulos . . . inductoresque acerrimos gnarosque nostri tergi." Lewis and Short interpret *inductor* here as "one who stirs up," "a scourger," Georges by "der Aufzieher von Schlägen," "der Durchprägler." Entirely apart from the difficulty of getting this sense for the word at all, I regard it as far better (and easier) to interpret by "painter," *pictor* (in the derisive spirit in which this word was applied to Fabius Pictor: cf. *Cic. Tusc. Disp.* i. 4), especially if, as has been recently suggested, the epithet meant "tattooer." Pliny *H.N.* 35. 102 has "huic picturae quater colorem induxit"; again, in 33. 122, he writes "pariete siccato cera Punica cum oleo liquefacta candens saetis inducatur"; finally, in 24. 49 he has "umor . . . cuti nitorem inducit faciemque gratiorem praestat." See also *inducibilis* in Lewis and Short. Naudet had something of my view in mind when he wrote: "inductores metaphorice, qui inducunt tergum plagis, ut artifices parietem tectorio."

We may render this as follows: "But there's Pinacium ('Picture'), her slave. See that! how comic, how picture-like his posture is. Verily he has been draining the wine—in littlish cups (*sic!*)—many a time—wine nearly neat, too—most cleverly." As Fennell remarks, *ad loc.*, this is sarcastic: "so far from standing like a picture (an allusion to his name) Pinacium is more than half tipsy . . . so that he cannot stand steady. . . ."<sup>1</sup>

In *Men.* 110 Menaechmus I, Epidamniensis, comes out of his house, intending to carry to Erotium meretrix a palla which he has stolen from his wife (130) and to dine with Erotium. As he commends himself for the shrewdness with which he has overreached his wife, Peniculus parasitus overhears him and applies for a share of the plunder (135). At 141 ff. the following dialogue occurs:

*Men.* Vin tu facinus luculentum inspicere? *Pe.* Quis id coxit coquos? iam sciam, si quid titubatumst, ubi reliquias videro.

*Men.* Dic mi, enumquam tu vidisti *tabulam pictam in pariete* ubi aquila Catameitum raperet aut ubi Venus Adoneum?

*Pe.* Saepe. Sed quid istae *picturae* ad me attinent?

Menaechmus' allusion is, to be sure, rather far-fetched; we have to suppose that he thinks of himself as the eagle or as Venus, of the cloak as Ganymede or Adonis. But just in this, as in the perversion of the name Ganymedes (deliberate, to my mind), lies part of the fun of this grandiloquent utterance.

In the fourth edition of Brix's commentary to the *Menaechmi* (by Max Niemeyer, 1891), there was a very interesting note, to the effect that *tabula in pariete* meant "nicht eigentlich Wandbild, sondern Nachahmung des Tafelbildes in der Freskomalerei." Reference was made to Helbig's view (*Rhein. Mus.*, XXV, 218) that the replacing of true Tafelbilder by the far less costly frescoes was an

<sup>1</sup> With the name Pinacium cf. *πινάκιον*, which sometimes, according to Liddell and Scott, denotes "a small or bad picture."

The name is thus a "redende Namen." In this very play Plautus shows how alive he was to the value of such names, for at 174 ff. he makes Gelasimus explain his own name, and at 242 Gelasimus again says "Nunc Miccotrogus nomine e vero vocor." Other places of similar character, noted by me years ago, are as follows: *Ba.* 240, 283-85, 362, 687-88, 704; *Cap.* 724-26; *Cur.* 414 ff.; *Cis.* 466; *Mi.* 289, 330, 494; *Per.* 120, 506, 624-25; *Poen.* 886; *Ps.* 229, 585 (see Morris' note), 653-55, 712, 736; *Ru.* 657 (if Sonnenschein's note is right); *St.* 630-31; *Truc.* 77-78a. For a discussion of these passages I may now refer to Dr. C. J. Mendelsohn's *Studies in the Word-Play in Plautus*, pp. 8 ff. (Publications of the University of Pennsylvania, Series in Philology and Literature, Vol. XII, No. 2, Philadelphia, 1907).

Alexandrian innovation, which, by Plautus' time, "nach der Antwort des Peniculus zu schliessen [145], welche die genannten Stoffe als geläufige bezeichnet, eine auf italischem Bode weit verbreitete Decorationsweise war."<sup>1</sup> Brix-Niemeyer then knew of but one representation of the story of Ganymede, on a Praenestine Spiegelkapsel, "während die Entführung des Adonis durch Venus bis jetzt auf erhaltenen Kunstwerken noch nicht nachgewiesen ist." Dümmler, in Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. "Adonis," I (1894), 391 ff., gave no hint of any picture representing the rape of Adonis by Venus. Nor do I see in his account any hint of a confusion of Adonis and Ganymede.<sup>2</sup> In the fifth edition of Brix's commentary (1912), Niemeyer reduces the direct comment on *Men.* 143 to four short lines, as follows: "einfach 'Gemälde an der Wand.' Das etwa, wie Helbig (*Rhein. Mus.*, XXV, 218) glaubt, ein Freskogemälde gemeint ist, liegt nicht in Ausdruck." Now, in point of fact, how can anyone decide whether such an expression as *tabulam pictam in pariete* refers to "Gemälde an der Wand" or to frescoes? So far as language goes, either could be meant. Fortunately, for the purposes of our discussion, it matters not which Plautus had in mind. I note, finally, that in the last edition Niemeyer completes his note by citing, without discussion, Terence *Eun.* 584 ff., and Plautus *Merc.* 315, as giving references to paintings—a rather inadequate list of references!

Plautus seems, then, here merely to have blundered, whether by accident or design. A deliberate perversion or confusion would be sufficiently humorous.

In the *Eunuchus* we have an exceptionally good passage. Chaerea adulescens, the supposed eunuchus, is describing to Antipho what happened while he was in the house of Thaïs meretrix. Thaïs had gone out to dine, taking with her some ancillae (580). Note now 581-89:

abducit secum ancillas; paucae, quae circum illam essent, manent  
noviciae puellae. Continuo haec adornant ut lavet.  
Adhortor properent. Dum adparatur, virgo in conclavi sedet  
suspectans *tabulam quandam pictam*: ibi inerat pictura haec, Iovem  
quo pacto Danaae misisse aiunt quondam in gremium imbrem aureum.

<sup>1</sup> On wall-paintings and easel-pictures see Mr. Cecil Smith in Smith, *Dictionary of Antiquities*, II, 391.

<sup>2</sup> For Venus' love of Adonis see especially Dümmler, in Pauly-Wissowa, I, 391-92.

Egomet quoque id spectare coepi, et quia consimilem luserat  
iam olim ille ludum, incendio magis animus gaudebat mihi,  
deum sese in hominem convortisse atque in alienas tegulas  
venisse clanculum per inpluvium fucum factum mulieri.

Here the poet himself gives the motive for his reference to the painting.

I come now to a particularly interesting passage, *As.* 746 ff., especially 761 ff.<sup>1</sup> Diabolus adulescens has contracted with Cleareta lena for her daughter Philaenium for a year. He has dictated to his parasitus a formal contract, in which, among other things, he has put down *leges* to govern the girl's conduct. Cf. 756-67:

*Pa.* Alienum | hominem | intro mittat neminem.  
Quod illa aut amicum | aut patronum nominet,  
aut quod illa amicae <eum> amatorem praedicet,  
fores oclusae | omnibus sint nisi tibi.  
In foribus scribat occupatam | esse se.  
Aut quod illa dicat peregre allatam epistulam,  
ne epistula quidem ulla sit in aedibus  
nec cerata adeo tabula; et si qua inutilis  
pictura sit, eam vendat: ni in quadriduo  
abalienarit, quo aps te argentum acceperit,  
tuos arbitratus sit, comburas, si velis,  
ne illi sit cera ubi facere possit litteras.

*Cerata* . . . . *tabula* in 763 need mean only a wax tablet for letter-writing; *ne epistula* . . . . *tabula* would then mean "let her not have any letter (received from anyone else) at all in the house or any wax tablet on which to write to another." With this cf. vs. 6 of Naevius' account of the flirt: "cum alio cantat, at tamen alii suo dat digito litteras." But in "et si qua inutilis . . . . litteras," 763-67, we clearly have reference to a picture on which there is wax. The reference may be to wax laid over a picture to preserve it or to encaustic painting.

For the protection of frescoes from damage by sun or air through the laying on of a mixture of olive-oil and "Punic wax," see Mr. Cecil Smith, in Smith, *Dictionary of Antiquities*<sup>3</sup>, I, 393 A (second full paragraph). Pertinent, too, is the statement in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*<sup>9</sup>, VIII, 186, and that by W. Cave Thomas, *Encyclopaedia Britannica*<sup>11</sup>, IX (1910), 367, that the Greeks used wax to protect their sculptures. See also A. P. Laurie, *Greek and Roman Methods of Painting* (1910), pp. 105-7.

<sup>1</sup> For a discussion of part of this passage, with reference to the word *poeta*, 748, see above, p. 149, n. 2.



For encaustic painting see Mr. Smith again in Smith, *Dictionary of Antiquities*<sup>3</sup>, II, 392 ff., s.v. "pictura," especially the following:

The Egyptians made use of preparations of wax at least as early as the 18th dynasty for preserving paintings. . . . We find a mention of the encaustic process in Greece in the Ode, of doubtful date, falsely ascribed to Anacreon (6th century B.C.): "Paint me my mistress with her soft black tresses and, if the wax can do it, breathing myrrh!" Otherwise encaustic painting does not seem to have been mentioned in literature till the conquests of Alexander had opened closer communication between the East and the West.

The time indicated in these closing words is precisely the time of the New Attic Comedy, the time, in a word, of the plays of Plautus and Terence, except where those plays reflect Roman rather than Greek ideas and conditions.<sup>1</sup> Mr. G. B. Brown, in the article "Painting," in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*<sup>11</sup>, XX, 483, also dates encaustic (in true paintings) from the time of Alexander. On p. 490 he reminds us that "it is known from the evidence of the Erechtheum inscription that the encaustic process was employed for the painting of ornamental patterns on architectural features of marble buildings. . . ." For further discussion of encaustic painting, see A. P. Laurie, *Greek and Roman Methods of Painting*, pp. 54-68.

In neither case, whether Diabolus adulescens had reference to a protective coating of wax or to encaustic painting, could Philaenium have had access to much wax: therein lies the joke.<sup>2</sup>

We are now ready to sum up. The passages cited show that to the Romans of Plautus' day references to fresco-painting and portrait-painting were intelligible. We may remember that before Plautus' time Q. Fabius had been called Pictor, though in a spirit different from that which animates some of the passages cited in this paper (see Cic. *Tusc.* i. 4). See above p. 151, n. 2.

One other point may be noted. We see that, aside from the references to portrait-painting and to Apelles and Zeuxis, the themes of the paintings, in so far as we have definite themes at

<sup>1</sup> For striking evidence of the extent to which the plays of Plautus and Terence do reflect, in some fields at least, the times of Menander, see my paper on "Travel in Ancient Times as seen in Plautus and Terence," *Classical Philology*, II, 304.

<sup>2</sup> Two other passages, less clear than those already treated, may be cited from Plautus—*Vid.* 30-36 and *Fragg.* 31 ff. (an incomplete passage). In the latter place painting and sculpture are mentioned together (see above p. 149, n. 1).

all, come from mythology; we have Venus and Adonis, Jupiter and Danae, Ganymede and the eagle, and scenes from the underworld. The themes are, in a word, exactly what we should associate with Greece, particularly from the time of Alexander. The themes recur in the frescoes of Pompeii, which have been traced back in large part to Alexandria; see Mau-Kelsey, *Pompeii*, p. 474, and the fine discussion, based on Helbig, in Boissier's *Rome and Pompeii*, as translated by Fisher, pp. 370-419. The themes, once more, are those of certain departments of literature, as represented, e.g., by Ovid; see Boissier, *loc. cit.*<sup>1</sup>

We note further that there is but one passage in Terence bearing directly and unmistakably upon our theme; that passage is, however, one of the best of all those cited in this paper. Here again<sup>2</sup> Terence is true to his art; he will not allow extraneous matter or matter not very clearly connected with his play to work itself into what he writes. The passage in the *Eunuchus* helps the play wonderfully; it is a sophisticated extenuation, by an appeal to the example set by Jupiter himself, of the wrong done by Chaerea adulescens to the girl, a civis Attica.<sup>3</sup>

In Plautus, again, the specific allusions to painting come from a few plays: from the *Asinaria* (two passages: 174 ff., 762 ff.), *Captivi*, *Epidicus*, *Menaechmi*, *Mercator*, *Poenulus*, and *Stichus*. The original of the *Asinaria* was written by Demophilus (*As. Prol.* 10-12); that of the *Mercator* by Philemon (*Merc.* 9-10); that of the *Stichus* by Menander (see the *Didascalía*).

Some confirmatory evidence can be got from a study of certain words, e.g. (*describo*), *pingo*, *depingo*, *pictor*, *pictura*. In some passages given above, notably *Poen.* 1271, *pictor* means "painter" in the highest sense of the term; so, *ibid.*, *pingo* is used literally of painting as a fine art. So again in *As.* 174; *Ep.* 624, 626 (sarcastic);

<sup>1</sup> For one important meaning of these facts see my paper, "The Originality of Latin Literature," the *Classical Journal*, III, 306-7.

<sup>2</sup> In writing "again" I have in mind my comment in *Classical Philology*, II, 5, note, on the scrupulousness of Terence's geography.

<sup>3</sup> As I remarked, in *Classical Philology*, II, 286, n. 1, end, since in the *δραγνῶπις* the girl in the play usually proves to be *ingenua*, in fact a *civis*, the playwrights take pains to assure us that she has remained *casta*.

*Men.* 143; *Merc.* 313 (sarcastic), 315 (sarcastic); *Vid.* 36. Cf. *As.* 399-402:

*Me.* Qua facie voster Saurea est? si is est, iam scire potero.

*Li.* Macilentis malis, rufulus aliquantum, ventriosus,  
truculentis oculis, commoda statura, tristi fronte.

*Me.* Non potuit *pictor* rectius *describere* eius formam.

Compare *Poen.* 1111-14 (by itself a less distinctive passage):

*Ha.* Sed earum nutrix qua sit facie mi expedi.

*Mi.* Statura hau magna, corpore aquilo. *Ha.* Ipsa east.

*Mi.* Specie venusta, ore atque oculis pernigris.

*Ha.* Formam quidem hercle verbis *depinxti* probe.<sup>1</sup>

Other examples of these words show them in more distinctly figurative senses, so that they have no more significance for our purposes than figurative uses of "paint," "portray" would have in such a discussion in connection with any English author.

In *Mi.* 1175 ff. Palaestrio servus is instructing Pleusicles adulescens to pose as a *naulericus* and to come after Philocomasium. Cf. now 1183 ff.:

*Pl.* Quid? ubi ero exornatus quin tu dicis quid facturu' sim?

*Pa.* Huc venito et matris verbis Philocomasium arcessito,  
ut, si itura siet Athenas, eat tecum ad portum cito,  
atque ut iubeat ferri in navem si quid imponi velit:  
nisi eat, te soluturum esse navim: ventum operam dare.

*Pl.* Sati' placet *pictura*.

*Mo.* 261-62 (the speakers are Philematium meretrix and Scapha nutrix anus) does not help much:

*Philem.* Tum tu igitur cedo purpurissum. *Sc.* Non do. Scita tu es quidem.

*Nova pictura interpolare*<sup>2</sup> vis opus lepidissimum.

Nor does *St.* 354. Still less important is *Poen.* 221. In *Ps.* 146 *pingo* is used of embroidery or the like.

#### COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Terence *Phor.* 268, "Probe horum facta imprudens depinxit senex."

<sup>2</sup> See Sonnenschein, *ad loc.* If *interpolo* in *Mo.* 274, and *interpolare* in *Mo.* 262, can be connected, through *polio*, with *lino* (see *lino* in Walde<sup>2</sup>), these two passages become of value for our purposes.

## PETRONIUS AND THE GREEK ROMANCE

By C. W. MENDELL

Some years ago Professor Abbott published in *Classical Philology*<sup>1</sup> a stimulating article entitled "The Origin of the Realistic Romance among the Romans." In that article he indicated many possible sources from which Petronius may have drawn something of his tone or matter. As Abbott himself suggests, all of these are sources for various specific characteristics of Petronius rather than ancestors from which the literary type proceeded. He concludes with the statement that "so far as our present information goes, Petronius seems to have been the inventor of the realistic romance."

Among the possible sources of Petronius, Abbott mentions the love romances of the Greeks which, if we could be sure that they were written in their developed form as early as the time of Petronius, would furnish a type of source different from the rest. Heinze<sup>2</sup> assumed for the romances an early date and developed the theory that Petronius wrote a parody of them. He finds in this way a forerunner of the type rather than of particular characteristics. I believe that this is the right direction in which to look for the literary ancestor of Petronius and that there are more indications of this relation than Heinze makes use of; furthermore, that Abbott's enumeration of characteristics reinforces rather than controverts this view, but that Heinze's theory of the parody nature of the novel is not the correct one.

I am skeptical of the propriety of calling Petronius' work a *realistic* romance, if that implies, as it seems to, an attempt on the part of the author to present human life essentially as it is.<sup>3</sup> The term "realistic" was presumably first applied to the book because it dealt

<sup>1</sup> VI (1911), 257 ff.

<sup>2</sup> R. Heinze, "Petron und der griechische Roman," *Hermes*, XXXIV (1899), 494 ff.

<sup>3</sup> This is the position maintained by Martin Rosenblüth in a Kiel dissertation: *Beiträge zur Quellenkunde von Petrons Satiren* (Berlin, 1909). Bürger also calls Petronius' work *ein echt realistischen Sittenroman*; see "Der antike Roman vor Petronius," *Hermes*, XXVII (1892), 345 ff.

with everyday folk, not with superhuman or heroic characters. But so did the love romances. That the hero and heroine were superlatively beautiful and in most ways extremely noble did not of necessity remove them from the sphere of possibility. Frankly accepted impossibilities were excluded from these romances, indicating a conscious effort at realism. But they still without apology introduced improbabilities of an extreme sort, and a succession of unusual experiences which in their total are quite incredible even though no particular one is by itself impossible. And this is just what Petronius does. He never asks us to believe in marvels, but he sends his characters through a series of adventures which the most credulous mind could not find probable. And even so we have but a small portion of them.

A parallel from another literary field may make more clear the actual position of Petronius in the scale of realism. Greek tragedy dealt with exalted characters of the heroic past; gods and goddesses and personages purely mythological. Aeschylus did not scruple to deal with impossibilities; there was good ground for Aristophanes' thrusts at his horse-cocks and goat-stags; his gods and his sea-nymphs and his winged Erinyes all trod the earth among his characters. Euripides made the drama much more realistic, and although mythical kings and princes and the dwellers on Olympus still make up the personnel, they show the emotions and actions of real people. The New Comedy took the next step. The logical successor of Euripides' tragedy, it reduced every detail to the plane of the commonplace. Ordinary people with ordinary emotions are its material, and it is called, in contrast to tragedy, "the mirror of life." But it is a *speculum vitae* only by comparison. It depicts only one side of life and that too distorted by exaggeration, with experiences treading on the heels of one another in such rapid succession and with such a persistently comic phase that they can hardly be termed, with any strictness of expression, realistic.

What is true of the New Comedy in this respect is roughly true of Petronius' work. It does not show the marvels of the early tales of adventurous travel. It confines itself to what might conceivably happen, but not to any truthfully realistic depiction of life. The romance of adventure, pure and simple, presented the frankly

impossible with the utmost confidence. The romance of love confined itself to the realms of possibility so far as incidents go and, like Euripides, presented persons of an exalted rank, in a serious fashion, acting in a natural and human manner. Petronius reduced the characters to middle and low society and dwelt on a very different phase of their experiences. Just what that phase was and the resultant tone of the treatment will appear later.

The acceptance of some such evolution of the prose romance does not imply that with the beginning of one type the preceding ceased to be written, but merely that in a general way this was the order of their first appearance and development of type.<sup>1</sup> This Heinze doubts. He thinks that there is no such relation between the romance of adventure and the erotic romance. They are, he holds, two totally different and unrelated types, alike only in the one point that their plots are not stationary. He seems, however, to be influenced by the fact that he places the only writer of the romance of adventure that we know, Antonius Diogenes, too late to influence Petronius, while at the same time he posits erotic romances before the time of the Roman novelist. This is too cavalier. Even without the evidence of Lucian in the introduction to his *True History*, it would be clear that the romance of adventure was a very slight variation from the professedly historic work of such logographers as Ctesias and Iamboulos. Without positive proof it is almost impossible to give up the generally accepted theory of development which recognizes a logical sequence from the novel of adventure to the erotic romance.

The dating of Greek romances is at best a hazardous undertaking. But there is certainly no ground for putting Antonius Diogenes later than Petronius. It has been assumed that his bilingual name disproves the statement of Photius that he lived shortly after the time of Alexander.<sup>2</sup> But Livius Andronicus came to Rome in 275 B.C.; Rome had come much into contact with Greek cities in such a way as to acquire Greek slaves long before that; Naples and Cumae were

<sup>1</sup> This distinction is clearly drawn by Otmar Schissel von Fleschenberg in *Entwicklungsgeschichte des griechischen Romanes im Alterthum* (Halle, 1913).

<sup>2</sup> This is the position of J. S. Phillimore in his article on the romances in *English Literature and the Classics* (Oxford, 1912).



Roman before 300; and before Alexander began his conquests Rome had conquered many a Greek in Campania. Furthermore, regardless of exact dating, his nearness to Ctesias and the other logographers makes it more than likely that he wrote before formal rhetoric had begun its sway.

The erotic romances, too, must be given much earlier dates than they used to receive. Jebb stated without hesitation that Chariton was a writer of the fifth century,<sup>1</sup> but a papyrus of 100 A.D. with a considerable fragment of his novel deducts from this date more than two hundred years at a blow.<sup>2</sup> The Ninos fragment cannot have been written later than 50 A.D., and in all probability was distinctly earlier.<sup>3</sup> These two romances have one thing in common which seems to me significant. Chariton's novel has much more deliberate rhetoric than the others that we possess, and the Ninos fragments indicate that that romance was similar to Chariton's in this respect. In psychological analysis, in balanced arguments, in brilliant descriptions, and in dramatic scenes, Chariton is far ahead of Xenophon, for example, or Achilles Tatius. It seems therefore not improbable that, although Rohde was wrong in his *actual* date for Chariton, he was right in his *relative* dating, and that the two romances of whose dates we have some slight indication are among the latest.<sup>4</sup> If Chariton is two hundred years and more older than he was generally believed to be, there is no reason to think that the rest may not be too, and internal evidence strongly suggests that they mark an earlier stage of development.

In consideration of the possibility of an early date for the romances, it seems not unlikely that too little weight has been given to a passage from Plautus.<sup>5</sup> In *Men.* 247, Messenio says to his

<sup>1</sup> See *A Companion to Greek Studies*, Cambridge, 1906, p. 161.

<sup>2</sup> Grenfell, Hunt, and Hogarth, *Fayum Towns and Their Papyri*, p. 74.

<sup>3</sup> See U. Wilcken, "Ein neuer griechischer Roman," *Hermes*, XXVIII (1893), 161 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Rohde, *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer*, 2d ed., p. 521: "Nur so viel scheint eine genauere Betrachtung seines Romanes zu lehren, dass er die Romane des Iamblichus, Heliodorus und nicht am wenigsten den des Xenophon vor Augen hatte und nachbildete." A fragment of Achilles Tatius of a date not later than 300 puts another of the romances much earlier than Rohde's dating. See *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, X, 135, No. 1250.

<sup>5</sup> Professor Henry W. Prescott has kindly called to my attention the fact that this point is brought out by Bousset, *Zeitschr. f. d. Neutestamentl. Wiss.*, 1904, pp. 18 ff.

master: "Quin nos hinc domum | redimus nisi si historiam scripturi sumus?" He has already complained of the traveling as follows: "Histros Hispanos Massilienses Hiluros | mare superum omne Graeciamque exoticam | orasque Italicas omnis, qua adgreditur mare | sumus circumvecti." This sounds more like material for a romance than for a history, and his conclusion indicates the further ground of similarity which led him to associate their wanderings with those of the romantic hero: "Hominem inter vivos quaeritamus mortuom; | nam invenissemus iam diu, sei viveret." There is nothing to contradict this interpretation in the other instances of the use of *historia* in Plautus.<sup>1</sup>

It is obvious since the discovery of the Ninos fragments that the rhetoric which could have influenced the romance was the rhetoric taught by such men as Seneca and his predecessors, not the rhetoric of the new sophistic. The balancing of arguments and the descriptive chapters are exactly the sort of thing which the regular rhetorical training would have cultivated. It by no means follows that the romances were expanded rhetorical exercises. The condensed plots which Seneca and the other rhetoricians collected were much more probably summaries of longer stories which the teacher presented in the form of an abstract for the pupil to practice on. The fact that many of them deal with actual historical incidents bears out this supposition and the modern case system of studying law furnishes a fair parallel. That the school teacher invented and the novelist borrowed is certainly a harder theory than the reverse. Parthenius, some thirty years before Christ, culling plots for Gallus to use, is a good example of the sort of thing that Seneca probably did to obtain for his classroom the material that has survived him. The interesting point for the present study is that he evidently had romances from which to draw.

Another parallel from the drama may serve to clarify the understanding of this development of type. Even in the time of Aeschylus the desire for the romantic element was strong. Colonization

<sup>1</sup> *Bacchides* i. 2. 50; *Trinummus* ii. 2. 100. R. Reitzenstein, *Das Märchen von Amor und Psyche bei Apuleius*, pp. 32 ff. and 62 ff., interprets *historia* and *fabula* differently, but to take *historiae inseruisse* as "wrote at intervals while engaged on a serious work" is very hard, and the whole argument is based on the unfounded claim that Apuleius found his entire matter in Sisenna.

had no doubt fostered it. In Aeschylus it is satisfied by the marvelous, the supernatural, and the strange. Such long stories as Io's of her wanderings have little reason for existing except as they cater to a public craving for romance. In the later dramatists, who catered to less naïve audiences, the strange and weird drop out and the love element enters to make good the romantic loss. Euripides incurs the charge of degrading the stage by introducing women in love among his characters. Finally, in the New Comedy, the love element is more regularly the central theme, but is reduced to a lower plane and treated with much less of dignity and seriousness.

So the romantic element in prose story-telling proceeds from the original travel motif with its marvels of imagination, the sort of thing that Lucian reproduces as an extravaganza in his *True History*, to the love story with adventure as a contributory element. And when it has run its course on the high and arid plane of pure romance, it is revived by an infusion of Roman salt by Petronius. Even in the part that rhetoric plays in these two very different fields the parallel holds roughly. The rhetoric of the Greek romance is the rhetoric of Euripides; the naturalness of Petronius is the naturalness of the New Comedy.

If we could be absolutely sure what the *Milesian Tales* were and just what Aristides wrote, one step in the development of the romance might be cleared up. But entire agreement on this point seems impossible; I merely venture a suggestion. Ovid's phrase (*Tristia* ii. 413), "Iunxit Aristides Milesia crimina [or carmina] secum, Pulsus Aristides nec tamen urbe sua est," is pretty generally taken to indicate that Aristides formed some kind of a whole out of the Milesian stories which he found or invented. The tone of the Milesian tale was presumably erotic and piquant.<sup>1</sup> Now it seems to me that the second reference of Ovid to Aristides (*Tristia* ii. 443) implies that his book was in reality a consecutive story: "Vertit Aristidem Sisenna nec obfuit illi Historiae turpis inseruisse iocos." *Fabula* and not *historia* is the regular word for short incidental stories. Many references to Petronius and Apuleius confirm the results of

<sup>1</sup> The best summaries of the evidence are Hans Lucas, "Zu den *Milesiaca* des Aristides," *Philologus*, LXVI (1907), 16 ff., and Otmar Schissel von Fleschenberg, *Die griechische Novelle* (Halle, 1913).

a study of Ovid's usage on this point.<sup>1</sup> *Historia* indicates something sustained,<sup>2</sup> and such a meaning is demanded by the passage in order to make possible the insertion of the *ioci* which, as elsewhere in Ovid, are evidently erotic anecdotes. Sisenna then inserted short anecdotes into his translation of the book of Aristides. (Possibly Ovid was misled into thinking that the original book of Aristides was a compilation, by the title of it which was very likely *Milesiaca* after the analogy of the *Babylonica* of Iamblichus and the *Indica* and the like of his predecessors.) The resultant book was the novel that caused scandal when found in the luggage of one of Crassus' officers after the battle of Carrhae, and it was probably in its Latin version that it was known to the Romans who refer to it. So it is not strange that the scandalous insertions came to be looked on by them as the essential part of the romance and that the name of the Greek romance that gave them a setting was misconstrued into a title for them.

In view of some such possibility, Apuleius' statement about his own work in his introduction is significant: "At ego tibi sermone isto Milesio varias fabulas conseram," etc. He means that in addition to merely Latinizing the *Onos* of Lucius of Patrae he will insert stories of erotic flavor and it is in these that much of his originality lies. He speaks of the inserts as *fabulae*, with the exception noted above, as does Petronius in introducing the story of the Matron of Ephesus (110, 113).

If this supposition about the *Milesian Tales* be true, then it is in the Latin romances only, in Sisenna, Petronius, and Apuleius, that there are short inserted anecdotes. The Greek romances have numberless episodic digressions which seem to take the reader far afield, but *fabulae* deliberately introduced as short stories they do not have. It looks very much as though the introduction of these were a Roman contribution to the romance. But before considering this point further it will be convenient to consider the characteristics of Petronius as presented by Abbott and to see how they bear on the suggested relation between the Greek and the Roman romance.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Petr. 39, 61, 92, 110, etc.; Apul. i. 20, 26; ii. 15, 20, etc.; Ovid *Met.* iv. 53; *Ex ponto* iii. 2. 97; *Tristia* iv. 10. 68, etc.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Quint. *Inst. Orat.* ii. 4. 2; in Apul. viii. 1, *historia* is used instead of the usual *fabula* and the insertion turns out to be a miniature romance.

Professor Abbott, in outlining the characteristics of Petronius' novel that must be considered in looking for a predecessor, notes, first, the place, Southern Italy; second, the generally low class of characters; third, the prominence of women; fourth, the efficient motif, erotic in spite of the framework furnished by an offended deity; fifth, the baffling tone of satire; sixth, the realism; seventh, the character-drawing, and, finally, the prose-poetic form. These must be compared one by one with the characteristics of the romance.

The scenes of the Greek novels range pretty freely over the known world, although one point is worth noting which I think has not been brought out. The range of scene is confined to the old Greek world, not to the expanded Roman world. Persia, Asia Minor, Egypt, Southern Italy, Sicily form the stage on which the characters of romance move. If the novels were a late invention, if they did not, as I believe they do, go back to Hellenistic times, this would be difficult to explain, but it is perfectly natural in the case of a type of literature firmly fixed before Rome had widened the bounds of the world. The early romance of adventure had treated in splendidly cavalier style Scythia and Thule, the lower world and the moon, until the tendency toward realism led the romancer to limit himself to the world his readers knew. But to return to the point, the scenes cover always a considerable range. Southern Italy and Sicily figure in Xenophon of Ephesus and also in Chariton, who is the representative of the romance who comes nearest to Petronius. The scene of the Roman novel in the fragment we possess is Southern Italy; there is indication that Massilia, too, figured in the story, and the haphazard wandering of the characters leaves little room for doubt that the scenes were even more varied.

The characters of the romances are mixed. From the great king of Persia to a humble herdsman, all stages of society are represented. The hero and heroine, ordinarily half-way between these extremes, are, in the greatest variety of ways, brought into contact with prince and pauper, pirate and pander. In Petronius there are no real potentates. But, granted the criteria by which his middle-class folk gauge position, the range is like that of the Greek. From Habinnas and Trimalchio to the fisherman who picks up the heroes after the wreck, we have the counterparts of the romantic satrap

and vassal. The general type of character must be noted (it is distinctly low by comparison), but the range of character is just as important, and in that Chariton and Petronius are alike.

In the matter of the prominence of women, I can find no reason to draw any distinction between Petronius and the romance. In Chariton, Callirhoe, Plangon, and Stateira are very prominent and sharply differentiated, and every romance furnishes its quota of well-drawn women. Manto, the Potiphar's wife of Xenophon, his ugly Kuno, Melite, the scheming widow of Achilles Tatius, the splendid farmer's daughter of Iamblichus—these can hardly be said to play a less important part than men.

In motif again there is little distinction beyond that of tone. The efficient motif of the romances is erotic just as much as is that of Petronius. In the romance it is circumstance that drives on the lovers through a mad succession of experiences even though these circumstances are sometimes motivated by the anger of a god offended by the obstinacy or arrogance of the lovers. Petronius, too, gives realism by making the force of circumstances govern the plot, but behind circumstances, he reminds us several times, is the anger of the offended Priapus. Like the low caste of his characters this choice of offended deity must be remembered as significant.

The baffling tone of satire is peculiar to Petronius. The romances are beyond all else ingenuous. The realism I have already discussed. The trend away from marvels had gone as far in Chariton as in Petronius. The only difference lies in the class of people treated: in keeping with his middle-class people, Petronius' adventures and melodramatic situations are middle class. I am inclined also to detect less difference than is usually found in the matter of character-drawing. What difference there is seems to me to be a result of the individual skill of a particular artist, not a question of type. As psychological analysis began to enter into the romance, characterization began to be more prominent. It is one of the chief results of strong rhetorical influences. And Chariton in particular depicts individualities: the faithful Polycharmus, a second Pylades, the gentleman Dionysius, the oriental queen Stateira, the big-hearted countrywoman Plangon; they are all real characters though not done with the genius of Petronius. Few of the romancers seem to



have been men of high genius. Finally, the prose-poetic form is peculiar to Petronius.

It is clear, I think, that in most of its characteristics Petronius' book is not far removed from the Greek romance. Further points of similarity might be noted. Heinze has dwelt on the framework and motivation, on the union and separation of Giton and Encolpius, on the steady chain of misfortunes, on the constant erotic temptations of the heroes. I would add the insistence on hairbreadth escapes which are the mainstay of both the Roman and the Greek novelist in holding attention, and the prevailing willingness of the characters to give up and die when crises arise. Details, too, bear out the parallel which framework and general characteristics make so clear. To name a few: the cloak motif or recognition by means of a garment (Petr. 12 ff.) is almost identical in the use made of it with the incident of Iamblichus in which Sinonius tries to sell a cloak and is arrested for robbing a tomb. Encolpius before the pictures (Petr. 83) recalls the opening of Achilles Tatius. The argument over punishment (Petr. 107) may be paralleled in any romance, perhaps best by the arguments of the pirates and the trial scene in Chariton. The shipwreck (Petr. 114, 115) might be taken bodily from Achilles Tatius or Xenophon of Ephesus. The comparison of Circe's beauty to that of a goddess (Petr. 126) suggests the familiar conceit that the Greek heroine would be taken for Aphrodite on the street. The magic potions of Greek romance are perhaps paralleled by the disgusting magic of Petronius (Petr. 134 ff.).

With all these points of similarity which cannot be mere coincidences, there remain the essential differences noted in passing: the class of characters treated, the baffling tone of satire, the prose-poetic form, and I would add the insertion of anecdotes unrelated to the plot.

It is time to consider the name under which the novel of Petronius has come down to us. Buecheler's *Petronii Satirae* is the accepted designation, but this title does not describe the book correctly if it implies conformity with one of the two types of satire distinguished by Quintilian, the Horatian and the Varronian. The hexameter form of the first is an unsurmountable obstacle, and Varro like Horace wrote short satires collected into books, not one long and

continuous composition divided into chapters. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that there is practically no manuscript authority for designating Petronius' book as a satire. On the other hand, it will not be difficult to see how the designation crept in during later years.

The majority of the best manuscripts read *saturicon*, either in superscription or in colophon (so BDEFG<sup>1</sup>). B, the oldest, has "Petronii Arbitri Saturicon." In the eleventh-century Paris manuscript alone appears any form of the word *satura*: "Petronii arbitri satirarum l. incipit," and this is corrected in the margin by the same or a contemporary hand to "Petronii arbitri affranii Satirici lib. incip." This has the appearance of being an attempt to remedy the strange-looking form *satiricon*, further changed to *Satyri* in the Trau manuscript (A), and modern editors have been equally prone to change it to suit their purposes. Savaron in his notes on Sidonius Apollinaris<sup>2</sup> says: "Petronii libellus mera est satura Varroniana, ut suo loco dicitur, ipse tamen Saturicum sive Satiricum maluit inscribere: quo modo commentarium dicitur pro commentario libro: Apologeticus pro apologetico libro." Casaubon says<sup>3</sup> that it is not worth while discussing why Petronius preferred *Satiricum* to *Satyra*. As a matter of fact there is no reason to think that he did. *Saturicon* is in all probability the Latinization of the Greek genitive plural, and the *satirarum* of P, which has been largely responsible for the classification of Petronius' novel as a satire, was an attempt by the copyist to correct this. The longer fragment of the Trau manuscript (A) shows that there were at least sixteen books in the novel so that βιβλία was probably the word understood in the Greek title which Petronius wished to suggest. His title was made on the analogy of τὰ Μιλησιακά<sup>4</sup> or τὰ Ἰνδικά,<sup>5</sup> and gives fair warning of the kind of romance that is coming, at the same time indicating clearly that here is no satire proper.

The characterization of Petronius' book which made appropriate his designation of it and which also led to its later classification as satire is twofold: first, characteristics of content, second,

<sup>1</sup> See Buecheler's edition of 1862.

<sup>2</sup> *Epistulae* viii. 11. Cited by Burmann, edition of Petronius (1709), p. 2.

<sup>3</sup> *De Satyra* ii. 4. Cited by Burmann, edition of Petronius (1709), p. 2.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Plut. *Crassus* 32.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Photius, *Bibliotheca*, No. 72.

those of form. In content the two branches of satire did not differ widely. Aulus Gellius (ii. 18. 6) indicates the nature of Varro's subject-matter to some extent, explaining that he was called Menippean because he modeled his work on that of the Cynic Menippus. The writings of Menippus were partly philosophical but rarely in a wholly serious tone.<sup>1</sup> Varro's subjects have a range as wide as Horace's: literary, philosophical, mythological, satires on the miser, on wills, on the education of children, on food and dinners, and on Priapus. The field of satire seems not to have varied much from Lucilius' day to Juvenal's, and from this field Petronius chose many an object for satiric attack. Oratory and poetry, education, the influence of money, the wealthy upstart, the *recitationes*, Priapus, the *captatores*, the women's devotion to a gladiator, magic, all are touched on by Petronius as well as by Varro and Horace and Juvenal. And so they are by Martial. The difference is that in the novelist and in the epigrammatist they are incidental, in the satirists they are the chief themes of the satires, treated for their own sake. In Petronius they are quite subordinate to the story. They indicate the satiric spirit of the author but do not prove him a satirist.

This point is well illustrated by the enumeration of characteristics in the thesis of Rosenblüth. After outlining the peculiarities common to Petronius and to satire, he proceeds to list those common to Petronius and to the mime, and practically every point which he brings up is applicable to satire as well, while the one thing that would be significant in Petronius, the dramatic form, is, of course, wanting. He cites, for example, the mixture of real names and appropriate nicknames, the use of colloquialisms, types of character, enchantments, mimic episodes, and so on. No doubt the mime, like the epic, like the prologues of comedy, had its influence in the formation of the romantic type. And so, in a greater degree, satire, the literary type truly congenial to the Roman, encroaching as it did on the epigram, on the lyric, on drama, and even on history, encroached also on the romance, and is responsible for incidental subjects in Petronius and for much of the tone throughout. But the novel of Petronius is neither mime nor satire. The essentials of its literary type are those of the romance.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Riese edition of Varro, *Introd.*, p. 9.

In form it is the Varronian satire only with which Hirzel and Schmid, Rohde and Ribbeck would allign Petronius.<sup>1</sup> Whatever theory we may hold of its origin or precise nature, there can be no doubt of the existence as far back as the time of Cicero of this prosimetric form of essay, probably not precisely defined as satire. And from the point of view of form there is a real and essential resemblance between Varro and Petronius and a difference between Petronius and the Greek romance. But in this respect too I think that an incidental resemblance is mistaken for identity of type. The metrical portions of the novel do not, with two or three short exceptions, further the narrative, while in the Varronian satire, so far as can be judged by the remains, the discourse was carried on indiscriminately by the metrical parts and by the prose. Seneca's farce on the death of Claudius furnishes a striking example of the actual mixing of prose and verse and shows the difference between such metrical passages and the insertions in Petronius which, except for form, are much like the ethnographical lore inserted in the romances. The Menippean satire made it seem natural to the Roman to introduce metrical inserts into his continuous discourse, just as the influence of satire in general led him to introduce satiric attacks on various familiar abuses.

In so far as the characters treated by Petronius are of a different class from those of the Greek romance I believe that this too is due to the spirit of satire. It is to a satirist like Juvenal that we must look for a parallel, to a man of nearly the same period who saw practically the same conditions. If he chose a bourgeois society to assail, it is only natural that Petronius should attack the same class, a class coming into great prominence during the early empire without too much credit in the eyes of the aristocracy. But I have already indicated that I do not feel the difference in this respect between the Roman and the Greek to be very great. It should be borne in mind that the part of the novel which we possess deals with a provincial town where Habinnas the *sevir* would be a man of no inconsiderable position.

<sup>1</sup> Hirzel, *Der Dialog* (Leipzig, 1895), II, 37; Schmid, "Der griechische Roman," *Neue Jahrbücher*, 1904, I, 476; Rohde, *Der griechische Roman*, 2d ed. (Leipzig, 1900), p. 267; Ribbeck, *Geschichte der römischen Dichtung*, III, 150.

Finally, like Sisenna and like Apuleius, Petronius inserts into his narrative anecdotes which are in no wise relevant or necessary to the progress of his novel, stories introduced for their own sake and not merely digressions in which even a Chariton might indulge. Such anecdotes are foreign to the atmosphere of feverish haste which marks most of the Greek romances, but absolutely in keeping with the rambling and casual tone of satire. Horace is full of them and rarely feels the need of his apology, *non longa est fabula*, which, however, is significant when taken in connection with the use of *fabula* by Ovid, Petronius, and Apuleius.

This scrutiny of the characteristics of Petronius as outlined by Abbott shows that the baffling tone of satire, the prose-poetic form, the class of characters treated, and, in addition to these, the insertion of anecdotes not strictly a part of the plot, are presumably the result of the influence of satire, while the remaining characteristics supplement the evidence which serves to define the literary type of the work as erotic romance.

Now, although Heinze maintains the similarity between Petronius and the erotic romance, he finds the tone of the former to be one of parody and makes this the determining factor in explaining the relation between the two. He cites the general tone of epic parody, the tragic pose of killing one's self at every crisis, always given up on a very slight pretext, and, finally, the exaggerated attitude toward dangers of every sort.

These are all parody in detail: of themselves they do not justify a characterization of the whole work. And when we stop to notice how such detailed parody appears in other branches of Latin literature, not remote from the romance, their significance seems even less probably that which Heinze would make it. For example, so far as the tone of epic parody is concerned, Horace and Juvenal offer much more obvious instances of the same, yet no one would feel that the satire of Horace and Juvenal was adequately defined as parody. The Roman comedy has passages which very obviously parody the tragedy, such as the recognition scene in the *Menaechmi*, but such details do not make the comedy as a whole a parody. The comedy furnishes also numerous instances of characters who express a fixed determination to die, usually a slave or a weak-willed lover, and this

determination presently vanishes. Dangers in the comedy are magnified enormously. But these facts do not prove that comedy belongs to the parody type of literature. It is true, to be sure, that the tone of the novel as a whole is largely a matter of feeling or impression and therefore dangerous ground for argument, but, so far as the consensus of feeling goes, the tone would seem to be nearer to one of realism than to one of parody, and I therefore feel more confident of my own impression that the tone of parody is confined to details.

To show that the romance as a whole was a parody it would be necessary, I think, to show that in its entirety, especially in so far as its main lines are concerned, the parody was obvious and sustained. Lucian, in the preface to his *True History*, gives fair warning that he is writing a parody and the reader is never given an opportunity to doubt the sincerity of the warning. The *Will of the Little Pig* is sustained parody. But if Petronius were the same, we should expect something more in the way of burlesque setting and fewer men with a normally developed sense of humor would have swallowed the romance as realistic and satiric.

Finally, the long incident of Trimalchio's dinner, forming as it does so considerable a portion of even the entire work, would be out of place in a parody of the erotic romance. Parody, as Heinze himself says in another connection, implies something parodied, and such an incident would be so totally foreign to the spirit and purpose of romance as to be utterly out of place in the parody. The dinner of the *nouveau riche* was an accepted subject of satire thoroughly congenial to the highly original writer of a romance penned in the satiric vein.

My conclusions are these. The novel of Petronius is not, strictly speaking, a realistic novel. It is an erotic romance and belongs to the developed, not to the early, type of romance. Its essential type characteristics are those of the romance. It is not a parody although it contains parody. It is not a satire although strongly influenced by the satiric spirit. It is a real romance written by a truly Roman artist; his national characteristics appear in the satiric bent, in the setting, and in much of the tone; his personal impress is felt in the excellent characterization, in the genial humor, and in the wealth of invention.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.



## STUDIES IN GREEK NOUN-FORMATION

Based in part upon material collected by the late A. W. STRATTON, and prepared under the supervision of CARL D. BUCK<sup>1</sup>

### DENTAL TERMINATIONS I. 2

WORDS IN *-ās*, *-ātos* AND IN *-ης*, *-ητος*  
(Exclusive of those in *-της*, *-ητος*)

BY CARL D. BUCK

1. *Verbal adjectives of the type εὑκράς, προβλής*.—Of words in *-ās*, *-ātos* and *-ης*, *-ητος* the class of most transparent origin is that in which τ is added to a root-form ending in ā or η; and with this must be considered the parallel class of the type ἄγνώς from root-forms ending in ω.<sup>2</sup>

In Sanskrit a similar addition of *t* is regular in the case of roots ending in a short vowel, e.g. *viśva-jī-t-* 'all-conquering,' *soma-sūt-* 'soma-pressing,' *madhu-kṛ-t-* 'honey-making, bee.' In use and frequency such forms are parallel to what from other kinds of roots are simply root-stems. Like these, they are most frequent as the final member of adjective compounds, which may of course be used substantively. The prevailing force is active, as in the examples cited; passive force, as in *deva-śru-t-* 'heard by, audible to the gods' is comparatively rare.<sup>3</sup> Forms with *t* added to a root ending in a long vowel are unknown in Sanskrit, but a few such occur in Avestan, as *dāmi-dā-t-* 'creator,' *θραotō-stā-t-* 'situated in the streams,' and in Latin, as *sacer-dōs*, *locu-plēs*.

In Greek the formation with *-τ-* has been largely displaced by that with *-τᾱ-*, yielding the numerous class of agent-nouns in

<sup>1</sup> See Introductory Note, *CP.* 5. 323 ff. For the present article and the next following, a partial collation of references made some years since by a former pupil, Mr. Edgar Menk, has also been of service.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. especially Fraenkel, *Gesch. d. griech. Nom. ag. auf -τήρ, -τωρ, -της (-τ-)* 1. 77 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Whitney, *Skt. Gram.* §§ 383, II, 1147; Wackernagel, *Altind. Gram.* 2. 1. 175; and especially Reuter *KZ.* 31. 190 ff.

-*τᾱς*, -*της*.<sup>1</sup> With a few exceptions,<sup>2</sup> it has survived only after root-forms ending in *ᾱ*, *η*, or *ω*, and belonging to that type which represents a monosyllabic form of dissyllabic bases.<sup>3</sup> The obvious examples are distributed as follows, the figures indicating the number of compounds, which will be cited in full in the word-list:

1. With inherited, general Greek *η*:  
 -*βλής* (13);                      -*κλής* (1).
2. With inherited *ᾱ*, Ionic or Attic-Ionic *η*:  
 -*κᾱς* (9);                      -*θνής* (5);                      -*τμής* (3);  
 -*δμής* (2);                      -*κμής* (7);                      -*τρής* (2).
3. With *ω*:  
 -*βλώς* (1);                      -*βρώς* (14);                      -*στρώς* (1);  
 -*γνώς* (3)                      -*τρώς* (1);                      -*πτώς* (1).

The meaning is partly passive, partly active, e.g., *ἄστροβλής* 'sun-struck,' but *ἀσπίδαποβλής* 'throwing away the shield'; *ἄγνώς* usually 'unknown,' but also 'unknowing,' *ἡμιβρώς* 'half eaten,' but *ἀνδροβρώς* 'man-eating.' But passive force greatly predominates, in notable contrast to the Sanskrit *t*-forms. Thus, passive are: all in -*κᾱς*, -*κλής*, -*δμής*, -*τμής*, -*τρής*, -*τρώς*, -*στρώς*, most in -*βλής*, -*γνώς*, some in -*βρώς*. Active (transitive) are: *ἀσπίδαποβλής*, *ἄγνώς* sometimes, most in -*βρώς*, also one each in -*κμής*, -*θνής* (see below).

<sup>1</sup> The intimate connection of this class with the simple *t*-formation has been placed beyond question by Fraenkel, *op. cit.* But his explanation of the manner in which the extension to -*τᾱς* took place (2. 157 ff = *IF. Anz.* 29. 63) can scarcely be regarded as adequate. The existence of masculines based upon feminine *ᾱ*-stems (*ρεαρίας*, etc.), in which class may still be reckoned a few of those in -*της*, was probably the chief factor in the transfer.

<sup>2</sup> Namely, a few in -*ι-τ-*, -*κ-τ-*, -*ρ-τ-*, and *ν-τ-*, which will be discussed later.

<sup>3</sup> Inherited strong-grade forms like *πλη-* (Lat. *plē-*, Skt. *prā-*), *βλη-*, *γνω-* (Lat. *nō-*, Skt. *jñā-*) and weak-grade forms like *δμᾱ-*, Att.-Ion. *δμη-*, beside *δαμα-* (*δμᾱτός* = Skt. *dāmtā-*), *θνᾱ* beside *θανα-*, etc., have contributed alike to what is substantially one type from the Greek point of view and plays a distinct rôle in the verb-system. Whether *στροω-* (and similarly *βρω-*, *βλω-*, etc.) represents a strong-grade form parallel to *γνω-*, or a weak-grade form with *ρω* = Lat. *rā* in *strātus* and Skt. *īr* in *stirṇā-*, according to the view one takes in this disputed question of phonetic correspondence, has no bearing on the function of *στροω-* in Greek. But this whole type of root-forms is clearly distinguished in its scope in Greek from the originally monosyllabic roots ending in a long vowel, with weak-grade in a short vowel, like those of *ιστημι*, *τιθημι*, *διδωμι*. And so also in the derivatives under discussion. There are no compounds in -*στας*, -*θής*, -*δώς* (but cf. the rare simplex *δώς* 'gift') parallel to the Avestan forms in -*slāt-*, -*dāt-* or Lat. *sacerdōs*, but only -*στᾱτης*, -*θῆτης*, -*δότης*.

Intransitive, like the verbs from which they are derived, are: ἀπτώς 'not falling,' ἀγχιβλώς 'coming near' (Et. M.) most in -θνής, as ἡμιθνήs 'half dead,' νεοθνήs 'just dead,' λιμοθνήs 'dead of hunger,' χειμοθνήs 'dead of cold.' So also ἀκμήs 'untiring, unwearied,' δονρικμήs 'afflicted by, slain by the spear,' σιδηροκμήs 'slain by the sword,' simply retain the intransitive force of κάμνω 'be wearied, afflicted, etc'; while only the late νεοκμήs 'newly wrought,' αὐτοκμήs 'self-wrought' are real passives to the secondary transitive use of κάμνω. The rare transitive use of -θνής, -κμήs in ἀνδροθνήs 'murderous,' Aesch. Ag. 814, and ἀνδροκμήs 'man-afflicting, man-slaying,' for which there is no corresponding use of the verbs, arose as a pendant to -θνής 'dead,' -κμήs 'afflicted, slain,' under the influence of such parallels as -βρώs 'eating,' beside -βρώs 'eaten'.<sup>1</sup> That is, we have to do here with a semantic back-formation.

The uncompounded βλής, which is quoted from an unknown poet (Hdn. 2. 121. 21) is probably an artificial abstraction from the compounds.

The forms which are regularly substantives are: ἐπιβλής 'bolt,' καταβλής 'bolt' (Hesych.), προβλής 'headland' (Soph.+; in Homer adjective), and συγκλής 'assembly' in Thessalian (συνκλείτος γενομένηs).

Besides these obvious derivatives of this type, the following in -ής (those in -ώς will be discussed elsewhere) are to be mentioned in this connection.

ἀπτής, *Inscr. v. Olympia* 164=ἀπτώς, might easily be explained as a transformation of the latter, under the influence of the compounds in -βλής, etc. But more probably it is an independent formation, from πτη- seen in πεπτηώς.<sup>2</sup>

Ἰγνητες (see below, p. 185) is a derivative of γνη- seen in γνήσιος. Another such would be ἐτερόγνης (Hdn. 1. 83. 2), but its authenticity is very doubtful.

<sup>1</sup> Similarly Fraenkel, *Glotta* 1. 275. His later interpretation of the use of ἀνδροθνήs and ἀνδροκμήs, *Nom. ag.* 1. 81 ff., is possible, but not necessary.

<sup>2</sup> For the graduation in the forms of πίπτω, cf. Meillet, *Mém. soc. ling.* 13. 44. πτω- belongs properly in the perfect indicative πέπτωκα (cf. ἔρρωγα beside ῥήγνυμι, Dor. ἔκα beside ἔημι), but spread at the expense of πτη- and became the usual basis of derivation (πτῶμα, πτώσις). ἀπτής may be a survival of an earlier formation than ἀπτώς.

*χερνής* is probably a compound of *νη-* 'spin' (*νέω, νήσω*), meaning first 'one who spins for daily hire,' 'a handworker,' like *χερνήτις* Hom. *Il.* 12. 433, hence 'poor.' Cf. Prellwitz, *Et. Wtb.*<sup>2</sup>, and Fraenkel, *Nom. ag.* 1. 87.

*δασπλῆς* beside *δασπλήτις* is probably, like *τειχεσιπλήτης*, a compound of *πλη-* (*πλᾶ-*) seen in *πλήτο* to *πελάζω*. Cf. the most recent discussion by Bechtel *Lexil. Hom.* 94 ff.

*θῆς* (from \**θᾶς*, cf. Cypr. *θᾶτας*) belongs to this type according to the derivation suggested by Brugmann, *IF.* 19. 388, namely from \**θfā-* (cf. *θοός, θύνω*). Against this, Fraenkel, *Nom. ag.* 1. 87.

As regards accent, words of this type are regularly oxytone, as in Sanskrit. Instances of a different accent appearing, in the case of a few rare forms, in our texts and lexicons (e.g. in L. and S. *ἀγχίβλως, ἀρίγνως, μελίτκρας*, or in Herodian the doubtful *ἐτερόγνης*), may be safely dismissed as errors. But *τριχόβρωτες* Ar. *Ach.* 1111 is generally retained, and perhaps rightly, though Wackernagel, *Gött. Nachr.* 1914. 29, regards this also as "ohne Belang." In contrast to the other compounds in *-βρώς*, all rare and poetical, this seems to have come into ordinary prose use as a substantive denoting moths, worms, etc. (cf. the Scholia to Ar. *loc. cit.* and Suidas, Pollux, Hesychius). Its substantive use, coupled with the well-known Attic tendency to shift from perispomenon to proparoxytone, may well account for a change of *τριχοβρώτες* to *τριχόβρωτες*.

These words belong distinctively to poetic diction, though a few of them are occasionally employed by prose writers. If we ignore the fifteen which are quotable only from lexicographers, grammarians, and scholiasts, we find that of the remainder thirty-seven occur only in poetry, while nine appear in prose writers, namely, *ἀστροβλής* Aristot.; *κεραυνοβλής* Theophr.; *ῥιμυθνής* Thuc., Aesch.; *νεοθνής* Plato; *χειμοθνής* Luc.; *ἀκμής* Paus., Dion. H., Plut.; *νεοβρώς* Hipp.; *ἀτρώς* Paus. (4. 8. 5, emendation); *ἀπτώς* Plato, M. Aurel. The only one occurring in prose inscriptions, and evidently a word of ordinary use, is the substantive *συγκλής* 'assembly' in Thessalian.

2. *Nouns and adjectives of the type κέλης, λέβης (ἀργής).*—The source of this type is by no means so clear as that of the preceding. The most probable connection is with forms pointing to an IE. *-et-*, that is *-e-t-* with *t* added to thematic verb-stems, as Lat. *teres -etis*,

*teges -etis*, *seges -etis*, etc., Skt. *vāghāt-*, *sraṇāt-*, *vahāt-*, and some Celtic and Germanic forms. Cf. Brugmann, *Grd.*<sup>2</sup> 2. 1. 425. These show the same variety of use as other *t*-formations, comprising feminine abstracts (Skt. *sraṇāt-* 'stream,' *vahāt-* 'vehicle,' etc.), verbal adjectives with passive (Lat. *teres* 'rounded off') or active meaning, and *nomina agentis*. It is this last use as seen in Skt. *vāghāt-* 'institutor of the sacrifice,' that agrees with that prevailing in Greek. The *-et-* would be preserved in Greek only in Hom. ἀργέτι, ἀργέτα beside ἀργήτι, ἀργήτα, and in derivatives like πενέστερος beside πένης. The otherwise regular *-ητ-* would represent a generalization of a strengthened grade *-ēt-*, of which there is some other evidence, as Avest. *fra-čarāt-* 'moving forward.'<sup>1</sup>

Examples of the most distinctive use, namely as *nomina agentis*, are: κέλης 'courser' (but κέληξ in Laconian), πλάνης 'wanderer,' γόης 'howler,' βέρρης δράπετης Hesych. (to ἔρρω), πένης 'poor man,' to which ἔχης 'man of substance' (*Et. M.*) is a pendant. So also ἔρπης 'shingles' is the disease that 'creeps' (ἐρπω) over the body, and λέβης 'basin, kettle,' though the root connection is unknown, was probably 'receiver' or the like, with the familiar application of *nomina agentis* to utensils as in κράτηρ, Eng. *mixer, boiler*, etc.

After the analogy of words like πένης, and also of χερνής (above, p. 176), were formed secondary derivatives denoting persons of a certain condition. A special group consists of military terms, as κούρητες 'young warriors' from κούροι; γυμνής 'light-armed soldier' from γυμνός; ψιλής (Aesch.) from ψιλός, though the latter was commonly used in this specialized sense without change of form; further, \*ὀπλής, implied by Ὀπλητες, beside usual ὀπλίτης, and δούρης Hdn.

<sup>1</sup> According to a totally different view *-ητ-* represents an extension of original *ē*-stems, both in the appellatives and in the proper names. Cf. Bechtel, *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1886. 378 ff., *Personennamen* 23 ff., Schulze, *Ber. Berl. Akad.* 1910. 807 (but the particular etymological combination there asserted is withdrawn KZ. 40. 287), Fraenkel, *Nom. ag.* 2. 200, and for the proper names also R. Meister *Ber. Sachs. Ges.* 1909. 8 ff. But there is no respectable evidence for the existence of an IE. class of *ē*-stems. Cf. Sommer, *die idg. ja und jo-Stämme in Baltischen* (*Abh. Sachs. Ges.* 1914) 14. If the status of IE. *ē*-stems was weak enough even with the support of the almost universally recognized class of IE. *ja*-stems, it is doubly precarious, now that the chief foundation for the belief in the latter has been shaken by Sommer's investigation. Furthermore, the stock example to show the extension of an *ē*-stem in Greek, μυκητ-, is not one of the typical words in point of usage, and is not an extension of an *ē*-stem, but of an *ā*-stem (see below, p. 178). For the proper names, see also below, p. 183.

2. 680. 34,<sup>1</sup> which is doubtless quoted from some poet who used it in the sense of 'spearman.' A similar derivative is probably concealed in the obscure Hesychian gloss. *δέρμητες*· οἱ ἐξ ἐφ' ἡμῶν<sup>2</sup> *περισσοί*.

From *γλοιός* 'slippery, knavish' comes *γλοιός*, used of a vicious horse (Hesych.) or person (Hdn. 2. 680. 16. *Et. M.*). *ἀμενής* 'weak' gives rise to *ἀμένης* 'weakling' (Hdn. 2. 684. 3 *σημαίνει δὲ τὸ παιδίον διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν μένος*). *δηλός*, *δειλῆτος*, Hdn. 2. 682. 27, is intended for a similar derivative of *δειλός* 'cowardly.' *λιπερνής* in the phrase ὦ *λιπερνῆτες* *πολιταί* Archil., copied in Crat. *Πυρίνη* (cf. Meineke 2. 124), is a transfer from an *σ*-stem form, if the ancient derivation from *ἔρνος* (Suidas) is correct, as is probable. *ὕψικέρης*, Hdn. 2. 683. 39, if genuine is a transfer to this type from the stem *ὕψικερᾶν*- (above, p. 26, n. 1), rather than an Ionic form of the same.<sup>3</sup>

The influence of the *nomina agentis* may also be recognized in *φάλης* (Ar., Theocr.) = *φαλλός*, and in such rare by-forms of adjectives as *δορυσσός* (Soph.) = *δορύσσοος*, *εὐκραιρής* (Maxim.) = *εὐκραιρος*, and *πάχης* = *παχύς* (*πάχητι* Evagr. *H.E.* 4. 7; *πάχητες*· *πλουῖοι*, *παχεῖς* Hesych.; cf. also Suidas, who makes a fictitious differentiation from *παχύς*, and Tzetz., *Hist.* 9. 304).

The remaining words have no resemblance in use to the preceding, and are mostly of obscure, in part clearly foreign, origin. The *τ*-inflection is secondary in *σής* 'moth,' gen. *σεός*, later *σητός* (Menand.+); in *μύκης* 'mushroom,' etc., gen. *μύκεω* Archil. 46 Bergk (cf. also nom. pl. fem. *μύκαι* Epich. 155 Kaibel), later *μύκητος* (Ar.+).

Beside *μάσθλης*, Lesb. *μάσλης* 'leather, thong of a whip, etc.' occurs *μάσθλη* (Hesych.), which may be a blend of *ἱμάσθλη* with *μάστιξ* (so Prellwitz, *BzB.* 26. 305). *ἄμης*, a sort of milk-cake, is of unknown origin. *ἀλάβης* (cf. *alabes* Pliny), a fish of the Nile, is of course borrowed. *τάπης* 'carpet, rug,' is of Persian origin (cf. Mod. Pers. *tāf-tān* 'spin') and probably furnished the model for *κάνης* 'reed mat' (cf. *κάνειον* 'reed basket').

*ἑσθής* 'clothing,' is isolated by its form (*ἑσθᾶς* in Pindar) and feminine gender, and is certainly a stranger in the ranks. It is

<sup>1</sup> But *μούρης* in the same passage is wholly obscure. Hilgard, Choerob. 1. 161. 6, takes both words as proper names.

<sup>2</sup> The correction to *ἐφ' ἡμῶν* is probable, but leaves the definition still obscure.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. J. Schmidt, *Pluralbildung* 367.



best explained as an early blend of the rare neuter *ἔσ-θος*, formed like *πλῆ-θος*, and a derivative containing the suffix *-τᾱτ-*, *-τητ-*.<sup>1</sup>

The accent of all words of this type was originally on the final syllable (of the nominative singular) as uniformly in Sanskrit (*vāghdt*, etc.), and as in the verbal adjectives like *προβλῆς*. But in Greek this was shifted to the preceding syllable when short, as in *κέλης*, *πένης*, etc.<sup>2</sup> Words with long penult regularly remained oxytone, as *ἀργής*, *ἐσθής*, *γυμνής*, *ψιλής*, *χερνής*, but several follow the analogy of the larger class, e.g., *κούρης*, *γλοῖης*, *μάσθλης*, if their accentuation is authentic. *ἐρπής* is so accented by Herodian (2. 682. 24), agreeing with the general rule, but *ἔρπη* is also common in MSS.

3. *Personal names like Μένης, Φέρης*.—This class of hypocoristic personal names is obviously based upon the appellatives denoting persons, such as *πένης*, *πλάνης*, etc. The great majority, constituting the normal type, are names of two syllables in the nominative.<sup>3</sup>

The names include those of (a) heroes of Greek legend, (b) Greek citizens, (c) foreigners.

a) *Legendary heroes*: *Κέλης* (Ath. 442a), *Τέλης*, *Φάνης*, *Φέρης*, *Μύλης*, *Μέγλης* (Hom. acc. *-ην* beside *-ητα*), *Σέβης*, *Ὀπλῆς*,<sup>4</sup> *Ἵπέρης*, *Ἵπιάλης* (Sophron 70 Kaibel = Hdn. i. 69. 14; or *Ἐπιάλης* Hdn. i. 69. 13), *Ἀφάρης* (Hdn. 2. 639. 5, now directly attested by *Ἀφάρητα* Bacch. 5. 129; cf. also *Ἀφαρητίδαι* Pind. N. 10. 65 and *Ἀφαρητιάδαι* Ap. Rhod. 1. 151). The name of the giant *Γύγης* (= usual *Γύης*) has gen. *Γύγητος* according to Hdn. 2. 78. 27.

b) *Greek citizens*: The type is most prevalent in Attic. Such Athenian names, most of them very common (cf. Kirchner, *Prosopographia Attica*), are: *Κράτης*, *Λάχης*, *Μάγνης*, *Μέλης*, *Μένης*, *Πάχης*,

<sup>1</sup> So Schwyzler, *IF*. 30. 443. But the assumption that *\*φεσ-τᾱτ-* arose by haplology from *\*φεστο-τᾱτ-*, as *ποτής* from *\*ποτο-τᾱτ-*, is not an easy one. Haplology is natural in *\*ποτοῖατ-*, but not for *\*φεστοῖατ-* any more than for *μεσῶτης*, *ἱεσῶτης*, *πισῶτης*, etc.

<sup>2</sup> This change probably originated in the case-forms which had the metrical value *υ - υ*, in which there was a marked tendency to recessive accent. Cf. Vendryes, *Mém. Soc. ling.* 13. 221 ff., Brugmann *IF*. 22. 176.

<sup>3</sup> Exceptions are: *Ἵπέρης*, *Ἀφάρης*, *Ἵπιάλης*, *Κεφάλης* (Hdn. 1. 69. 14, 2. 684. 1; cf. Boeot. *Κεφάλεις* nom. only, and Eretr. *Κεφαλῆτης*), *Ἀγέλλης* (below, p. 180), Pamph. *Μεγάλης*, *Ἀγάθης* (below, p. 180). Compounds do not follow this type, which is distinctly hypocoristic, and in *Θειομένης* Schol. Ap. Rhod. 1. 131 the *τ*-inflection instead of the usual *σ*-inflection is an intrusion from that of *Μένης*. But compounds occur in the related Boeotian type, for which see below, p. 182.

<sup>4</sup> The eponym abstracted from the Athenian *Ὀπληγες*. For *Ὀπλῆς* as a man's name in Pisidia, see below, p. 184.

Φάνης, Χάρης, Χρέμης. 'Αγγέλης occurs only in the nominative in Attic (*IG.* 2. 2100), but cf. Rhod. gen. 'Αγγέλητος (*IG.* 12. 1. 764. 27), while the  $\sigma$ -stem forms seen elsewhere may be secondary (see below, 183). Δράκης, Ar. *Lys.* 254, *Eccl.* 294, occurs elsewhere only in Ael. *Ep.* 4 (Δράκητι). Τρόμης, Dem. *De cor.* 130 is perhaps only the malicious invention of the orator. (To these Athenian names the appropriate dog's name Λάβης Ar. *Wasps* 836 may be appended.)

Many of these Athenian names occur also with more or less frequency in various other dialects, namely Κράτης, Λάχης, Μέλης, Μένης, Φάνης, Χάρης, 'Αγγέλης. Cf. also Thess. Φρόνης (gen. Φρόν-ετος in a fifth-century inscription, *JHS.* 33. 313), Meg. Τέλης (*IG.* 7. 8-11), Astyp. Φέρης (*IG.* 4. 1418.; 12. 3. 212; 12. 5. 2. 1003), Τύχης of unknown origin (*IG.* 14. 2011), Arc. Πάνης(?),<sup>1</sup> Arg. Τρύγης, and the Pamphylian forms of the originally Phrygian name Μάνης, namely Μάνēs, gen. Μάνετις (Lancoronski 1. No. 54), in later spelling Μάνεις, gen. Μάνειτις (*ibid.* Nos. 83, 86, 87), of the otherwise unknown Μεγάλης, namely, nom. Μλειάλε, dat. Μλειάλετι (*ibid.* No. 54, later gen. Μεγάλειτις (*ibid.* No. 75), further gen. Féκειτους (*ibid.* No. 89; Féκης otherwise unknown), gen. Ζώφειτους (*ibid.* No. 84; cf. Cyp. Ζώφης, Lesb. Ζώνης), 'Αγάθεις (*ibid.* No. 83, nom. only, but probably belonging here). Cf. also in literary sources Boeot. Κέβης (Xen., etc.), Γέρης (Strabo, Paus.), Arc. Σμίκρης (Xen.), Acarn. Κύνης (Thuc.), and in Suidas Πόλλης of Aegae, Κόρης, Χέρης, Πάσης.

The fact that these names follow the  $\tau$ -inflection in the Attic writers and later lexicographers is, of course, not conclusive evidence of their native inflection. And of the numerous examples of  $\tau$ -forms in dialect inscriptions the great majority are not early enough to preclude the possibility of Attic influence. But the Thessalian

<sup>1</sup> Only nom. Πανēs *IG.* 5. 2. 387, which the editors take as Πανής contracted from Πανέας, while R. Meister, *Ber. Sachs. Ges.* 1909. 10 takes as Πάνης. This is more probable, likewise Arg. Τρύγης rather than Τρυγής (as editors, *BCH.* 27. 270; 33. 171, thoughtlessly followed in my *Grk. Dial.* No. 82). For while names in -ής from -εās are attested from an early period in Ionic and in some of the Doric islands (cf. my *Grk. Dial.* § 42. 2), they are unknown in the Peloponnesus, except for late and obviously imported Έρμής, 'Απελλής, etc. In Arcadian a Πανής would stand alone against about eighteen names in -εās, many occurring with great frequency (e.g. Δαμέας 18 times). An Arg. Τρυγής would stand alone, except for late Έρμής, 'Απελλής, against about a dozen forms in -εās.

and Pamphylian forms at any rate are beyond suspicion, and as the  $\tau$ -inflection agrees with that of the legendary names in Homer and in Doric poetry, and furthermore, with that of the appellatives, there is every reason to regard this as the original Greek type, and to accept the  $\tau$ -forms as normal in all dialects where there is no evidence to the contrary.<sup>1</sup> But in some dialects there is such evidence.

In Ionic inscriptions the  $\tau$ -inflection is almost unknown, and the few examples are best attributed to Attic influence. Thus from  $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\eta\varsigma$  we find gen.  $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$  in *SGDI*. 5692a 34 (about 278 B.C.) and 5437. 6 (second century B.C.), but  $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\epsilon\omega$  5495. 30 (early fifth century B.C.). From  $\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\varsigma$  *SGDI*. 5515 (before 353 B.C.) has gen.  $\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$  l. 48, but  $\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$  l. 15, while *Diog. L.* 8. 1. 25 has  $\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\omega$ . Other such names show only the vowel inflection, as  $\phi\acute{\alpha}\nu\eta\varsigma$ , gen.  $\phi\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\omega$  *ibid.* 5515. 10, Eretr.  $\phi\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\upsilon$  'Αρχ. 'Εφ. 1911. 11 (where also  $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\upsilon$ );  $\pi\acute{\upsilon}\rho\eta\varsigma$ , gen.  $\pi\acute{\upsilon}\rho\epsilon\omega$  5680 (cf.  $\pi\acute{\upsilon}\rho\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$  τοῦ Μιλησίου Athen. 620e),  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\eta\varsigma$ , gen.  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\epsilon\omega$  Delphin. in Milet 122. II. 59 (cf. Meg.  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$ )  $\pi\acute{\iota}\gamma\eta\varsigma$ , gen.  $\pi\acute{\iota}\gamma\epsilon\omega$  5727a 28 (a foreign name, but declined as a  $\tau$ -stem in Attic writers),  $\kappa\acute{\omicron}\mu\eta\varsigma$ , gen.  $\kappa\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\omega$  in Hipp. (cf.  $\kappa\acute{\omicron}\mu\eta\tau\alpha$  *CIG*. 8901, *Hdn.* 2. 679. 23). So it must be recognized as the normal Ionic practice that names which correspond to Att.  $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\eta\varsigma$ , etc., follow the analogy of names of the first declension, so that the two classes become indistinguishable.<sup>2</sup>

The statement of Moeris that  $\theta\alpha\lambda\eta\varsigma$  is Attic and  $\theta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\varsigma$ ,  $\theta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$  Hellenistic is an approximately true picture of the literary practice.

<sup>1</sup> Otherwise Fick-Bechtel, *Gr. Personennamen* 23 ff.; R. Meister, *Ber. Sachs. Ges.* 1909. 8 ff. See above, p. 177, and below, p. 183.

<sup>2</sup> A large class of names in  $-\eta\varsigma$  is commonly regarded as resulting from contraction of those in  $-\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\varsigma$ , and accordingly accented  $-\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ , e.g.  $\theta\alpha\lambda\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ ,  $\lambda\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ , etc., so explained and accented by Herodian 1. 65. 9. This whole assumption is discredited by R. Meister, *Ber. Sachs. Ges.* 1909. 9 ff. But even if we accept the traditional accentuation of  $\theta\alpha\lambda\eta\varsigma$  as correct, it is impossible to determine just which names should be classed with it, and the editors' accentuation of many of those occurring in the Ionic inscriptions is necessarily arbitrary (e.g.  $\Sigma\acute{\omega}\tau\eta\varsigma$  or  $\Sigma\omega\tau\eta\varsigma$ ?). The extreme view that all the Ionic forms with vowel declension are perispomena, and that we should accent  $\chi\alpha\rho\eta\varsigma$  because of  $\chi\alpha\rho\epsilon\omega$  (so Wilamowitz, *Ber. Berl. Akad.* 1904. 621) is the least likely of all.

Another question of accent, again assuming the correctness of  $\theta\alpha\lambda\eta\varsigma$ , is that of the  $\tau$ -forms employed by later writers. Here we have the authority of Herodian for  $\theta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$ ,  $\theta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$  (2. 683. 10) but also  $\Pi\omicron\delta\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$  (2. 683. 12). It is at best only a matter of convention. The accentuation of the numerous Egyptian proper names in the papyri is a separate question. Cf. Mayser 274 with references.

But the Hellenistic usage simply shows the final absorption of the name into the normal Attic type of *Μένης*, etc., while the older Attic writers, as well as some of the Hellenistic, retain the Ionic vowel inflection.

In Boeotian there are a few examples of names in *-εις*, gen. *-ειτος* (Boeot. *ει* = Att. *η*), as *Κράτεις*, *Κράτειτος* (*IG.* 7. 1728, 2714), *Φάνεις*, *Φάνειτος* (*ibid.* 1752). These are possibly due to Attic influence. At any rate the usual Boeotian type is that with consonant doubling and nominative in *-ει* or *-εις*, genitive in *-ιος*, e.g., nom. *Θάλλει* and *Θάλλεις*, *Φίλλει* and *Φίλλεις*, *Ξέννει*, *Μέννει*, *Μνασίλλει*, etc. (full list of those in *-ει* in Sadée, *de Boeot. tit. dial.* 50 ff.), gen. *Τέλλιος*, *Φίλλιος*, *Ξέννιος*, *Μνασίλλιος*, *Τιμόλλιος*, etc.

The probable explanation of this type is as follows. The genitive in *-ιος* (= *-εος*) was formed after the analogy of *σ*-stems, just as *Κράτεις* etc. in various other dialects (below, p. 183). The names now shared in such changes of original *σ*-stem proper names, under the influence of those of the first declension, as are observed in certain other dialects (cf. my *Greek Dialects* § 108. 2). Hence acc. *Δαίμμεν* like *Δαμοτέλειν*, and the vocative in *-ει* (for *η*, cf. Arc. *Ἀτέλη*), which is the probable source of the nominative in *-ει* and of the consonant doubling throughout. Even in the genitive we find an isolated parallel to Lesb. *Μένη*, *Θεογένη*, Cret. *Ἀλκιμένη*, etc., in *Τέλλη Θηβαίου* in a Delphian inscription (*SGDI.* 2502. 92. 110; cf. Ion. *Τέλλεω*, above, p. 181).

While the Boeotian type is in its origin, we are convinced, identical with that of Att. *Μένης*, it spread far beyond its usual limits in the case of the numerous longer names like *Μνασίλλει*, *Εὐνόμμει*, *Ἀθανίκει*, etc.

In Lesbian, where all the examples are late, there are a few instances of *τ*-inflection, as *Μένητος*, *Κράτητος*, *Κάμητος* (so probably *Κ[ά]μιτος* *IG.* 12. 2. 532; cf. *Καίμμη* below) perhaps due to Attic influence. Usually such names show the same inflection as the *σ*-stem proper names, namely as *η*-stems following the analogy of *ᾱ*-stems. Thus gen. *Μένη*, *Φάνη*, *Τείμη*, *Καίμμη*, *Ζώνη*, are parallel to gen. *Θεογένη*, *Διοφάνη*, *Ἐχεκράτη*, etc. Cf. my *Greek Dialects*, § 108. 2 and Hoffmann 2. 548.

In Cyprian there are three genitive forms which in all probability belong to names of the *Μένης* type, namely *Πίγιρῆφο* (cf. *Πίγρης*,

gen. Πίλρητος in Attic writers, Ion. Πίλρηω), Φίλῃφο (cf. Boeot. Φίλλει), and Τιμάσῃν. Cf. R. Meister, *Ber. Sächs. Ges.* 1909. 8 ff.; 1911. 25, 37. The *ρ* in the last two forms represents the glide sound before *ο*, as in Cypr. Τιμοχάρηφος, Coreyr. Τλασίαφο, etc.; and the genitive formation is parallel to that of the masculine *ā*-stems (-έν to the usual Cyprian -άν, -ε[ρ]ο to its antecedent -άο).

Meister finds in these Cyprian forms confirmation of the view that names like Μένης were originally vowel stems. But for those who are convinced that the *τ*-inflection is original (see above, p. 177) there is no difficulty in regarding the vowel inflection here, and in Ionic and Lesbian, as secondary, due to the analogy of the masculine *ā*-stems, just as the vowel inflection of *σ*-stem names in Lesbian and elsewhere (cf. my *Greek Dialects* § 108. 2) must be so regarded.

Besides the confusion with the vowel declension, as seen in Ionic, Lesbian, Cyprian, and occasionally elsewhere, there is some confusion with *σ*-stem names in -ης. The transfer to the *σ*-declension in Boeotian has already been noted. Cf. also Ion. gen. Κράτεω (SGDI. 5515. 15), Rhod. Κράτεω (IG. 12. 1. 1338), Ther. Κράτους with Attic -ους (IG. 12. 3. 659); Ion. gen. Ἀγγέλεω SGDI. 5668, Lac. acc. Ἀγγέλη (IG. 5. 1. 931), compared with Rhod. Ἀγγέλητος; Rhod. Μάνεω (SGDI. 4245, 534), Κότεω (IG. 12. 1. 1337), foreign names which also appear with *τ*-inflection; Lesb. Ζώους (IG. 12. 2. 35, etc.) with Att. -ους, contrasted with Ζωή, Pamph. Ζώφειτους.

The analogy of names in -κλῆς, gen. -κλέους is very often followed by other names in -ης in the papyri and in inscriptions of Asia Minor, e.g., gen. Ἀπελλέους to Ἀπελλῆς, gen. Ὀπλέους, Μολέους beside Ὀπλητος, Μόλητος, etc. Cf. Mayser 281, Crönert 162 ff., Kretschmer 423.

Conversely, vowel stem and *σ*-stem names sometimes appear in late times with *τ*-forms, e.g. Ἐρμῆτος pap. Goodspeed No. 30, *passim*; Ἡρακλήτι IG. 14. 1001; Ἀπελλῆτος pap. Ox. No. 53; Εὐτυχῆτος, pap. Brit. Mus. 2. p. 254, 29. Cf. Crönert 162 ff., and also below, p. 186.

c) Names of foreigners: How far the representation by forms of the Μένης type is based upon the presence of *t* in the original names is often not to be determined. But this is clearly the case with those taken from Egyptian, where one of the commonest types

of names is that in *-et*, as *Beket*, *Khampet*, *Menkhet*, *Phanet*, etc. Aside from those occurring in Greek writers, as *Μένδης*, *Τάγης*, *Μήνης*, the papyri are full of such names, which regularly follow the *τ*-inflection, but also, very frequently, the analogy of Greek names in *-κλῆς*. Cf. Mayser 274 and 281.

Asia Minor names which in their Greek transcription follow the *τ*-inflection, either regularly or occasionally, probably owe this simply to the analogy of Greek names like *Μένης*, and were originally vowel stems. Such are Trojan *Δάρης* and *Μύνης* of Lyrnessus in Homer, Lydian *Κάμβλης* in Attic writers, and *Βάμβλης* Hdn. 2. 680. 8, which is also perhaps Lydian, Phrygian *Γύης* Hdn. 1. 59, 22. Carian and Lycian *Πίγρης* has gen. *Πίγρητος* in Attic writers, Ion. *Πίγρεω*, Cypr. *Πίγιρέφο* (above pp. 181, 182), while *Πιγρέους* (*JHS.* 34. 3. No. 5) shows the late type so frequent in Asia Minor (above p. 181). *Μάνης*, probably Phrygian (Kretschmer 198), has *τ*-inflection in Pamphylian (above, p. 180) and in Pisidia (*Μάνειτος*, also *Μανέους*, Lancoronski 1. Nos. 91, 150). *Μόλης* (also written *Μώλης*), very frequent in inscriptions of Lycia, Pisidia, and Cilicia, has usually *Μόλητος*, but also *Μολέους*; cf. Kretschmer 360, and, for Cilicia, Heberdey and Wilhelm, *Reisen in Kilikien* No. 220 (*Μόλητος*, *Μόλητι*). *Ὀπλης*, gen. *Ὀπλητος* and *Ὀπλέους*, acc. *Ὀπλητα*, dat. *Ὀπλη*, in inscriptions of Termessus (cf. Lancoronski 2. Index, *BCH.* 23. 183–86, 292–96), in spite of its Greek appearance, whence the usual transcription with *ʹ*, is probably only the adaptation of a foreign name. *Κότης* (*Κόττης*), found in inscriptions of Pisidia (*Κοττέους* Lancoronski 2. Nos. 32, 92), etc., passed to Rhodes (gen. *Κότεως* *IG.* 12. 1. 1337) and its colonies, showing gen. *Κότητος* at Agrigentum (*IG.* 14. 952). *Σύκης*, gen. *Σύκητος* in Pisidia (Lancoronski 2. No. 1). Lycian *Τρεμίλης* = *Trēmīli* has gen. *Τρεμίλου* and *Τρεμίλητος* according to Hdn. 1. 69. 19.

*Βάγης*, a Scythian (Iranian) name in inscriptions of the Euxine, usually follows the first declension, but gen. *Βάγητος* also occurs Latyshev 2. 402. 40. The *τ*-inflection of *Ναρσῆς* has no foundation in the Persian form (Justi., *Iran. Namenbuch* 221 ff.). Macedonian *Βέρης* corresponds to Grk. *Φέρης*. *Φέλλης*, name of a king of Tyre, is made to follow the *Μένης* type by Josephus, *contra Apionem* 1. 123. *Μόργης* is the eponym abstracted from the Oenotrian *Μόργητες*.



4. *Ethnica*.—The Rhodian *Ἰγνητες* (Apoll. Dysc., Hdn., Hesych., Steph. Byz.) were *ἰθαγενεῖς* (Hdn. 1. 401. 21), *οἱ γνήσιοι Ῥόδιοι* (Hdn. 2. 678. 9), and the name is from *\*ἐν-γνητες* 'indigenae,' a verbal adjective of the *προβλής* type (above, p. 175).<sup>1</sup> The name of the Athenian tribe *Ὀπλητες* rests upon an appellative *\*ὀπλῆτες* parallel to *γυμνῆτες*; and that of the *Κουρήτες* of Pharon, there is no good reason to doubt, upon *κούρητες*.<sup>2</sup> *Κρήτες*<sup>3</sup> and *Μάγνητες* are of unknown origin, very likely pre-Hellenic. The inhabitants of the Boeotian *Φαραί* were called *Φάρητες* (Steph. Byz.). The majority of ethnica of this type are foreign. Thus the Libyan *Φρήτες*, Aethiopian *Νίγρητες*, Pisidian *Ὀρβλητες* (*φυλῆς Ὀρβλητος* Lancoronski 2. No. 15), Maeotian *Τάρπητες*, German *Νέμητες*, Oenotrian *Μόργητες*, Iberian *Κύνητες*, *Κέρητες*, *Μίσγητες*, *Ἑσδοητες*, *Γλῆτες* (*Τλῆτες* is probably an error for the same, cf. Hdn. 1. 402. 5 with footnote) or *Ἰγλῆτες* (Strabo 166). *Τριτωνομένδητες* and *Καυλομήκητες* are inventions of Lucian.

5. *Geographical names*.—The great majority of these are foreign. The one obvious Greek derivative is Plato's name for a river in Hades, *Ἀμελῆς*. There are only a few which designate localities in Greece proper, as *Ἄρης*, place in Euboea (St. Byz.), *Χάρης*, river in Argolis (Plut. *Arat.* 28), *Μάσης*, town in Argolis (Hom.+).<sup>4</sup> *Μῆς* (St.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Solmsen, *Beiträge zur griech. Wortforschung* 215; Blinkenberg, *Hermes* 50. 274 ff. The name was probably that which the pre-Dorian inhabitants of Rhodes gave to themselves (so Blinkenberg), and thus the parallelism with Arcadian-Cyprian *lv-* for *ἐν-* is not accidental. The uncompounded *Γνῆς* is less well attested, and probably a fabrication of the grammarians, induced by the relation of *\*Ερεόκηρες* to *Κρήτες*, cf. Blinkenberg.

<sup>2</sup> The recessive accent of *\*Ἰγνητες* and *\*Ὀπλητες* is normal in the proper names. The differentiation between *κούρητες* and *Κουρήτες*, as stated by Herodian (1. 63. 26; 2. 640. 23), is the opposite of what would be expected, and is open to suspicion. Cf. Fraenkel, *Nom. ag.* 2. 200. Besides its ethnic use, *Κουρήτες* designates a class of semi-divine beings, and in this sense appears as *Κωρήτες* in Cretan (*SGDI.* 5039, 5041, 5075), a form which confirms the connection with *κούρητες* from *κούροι* (cf. Cret. *κύρα* = Ion. *κούρη*). It also denotes a priestly body at Ephesus (*SGDI.* 5589; cf. *πρωτοκούρης*, *Gr. Insc. Brit. Mus.* 3. 2. p. 319).

<sup>3</sup> With its old compound *\*Ερεόκηρες* (Hom.+), and the later *Νεόκηρες* (Polyb.) and *ἡμικρήτες* (Lycophron 150, but accent?). *\*Εγκρης* Hdn. 1. 64. 29; 2. 681. 15 = Choerob. 1. 161. 29 is an error for *\*Ετεόκηρες*. Cf. Lobeck, *Paralip.* 81, and Hilgard, Choerob. *loc. cit.* and 1. 186. 36.

<sup>4</sup> *Μάσης* from *Μάνσης* now quotable in an Argive inscription, *Mnemosyne* 44 (1916). 221. 4. The name is very likely of pre-Greek origin, as assumed by Fick, *Vorgriech. Ortsnamen* 71, to whom the earlier *Μάνσης* was, of course, unknown.

Byz.) is only another form for the usual *Μνοῦς* in Ionic, and is probably due to the influence of other Asia Minor names in *-ης*. *Μέλης*, a river near Smyrna, of which *Μήλης*, *ποταμὸς Κολοφῶνος* (Hdn. 1. 62. 15; 2. 680. 4), is perhaps only a variant, might be Greek, but more probably belongs with other Asia Minor names.

Such are: *Ἀκέλης*, river and town in Lydia (Hdn. 1. 69. 15), with which *Ἀχέλης*, river near Smyrna (Schol. *Il.* 24. 216) is doubtless identical; *Κάλης*, river and town in Bithynia (*Κάληξ* Thuc. 4. 75; *Κάχης* Diod. Sic. 12. 72); *Πύδης*, river and town in Pisidia, gen. *Πύδητος* and *Πύδου* (Hdn. 2. 639. 19). From other regions: *Βέρης* in Thrace, *Φάγρης* in Paeonia; *Ζάμης* in Arabia; *Μένδης* in Egypt; *Τύνης*, *Σέρβης*, *Ἀδρύμης*, and *Νίγρης* in Africa; *Ἑλέης* (Strabo 252; cf. acc. *Haletem* or *Heletem* Cic.) and *Μέμβλης* (Lyc. 1083) in Italy; *Καβάρης* (Hdn. 2. 684. 1) and *Κύρης* (Hdn. 1. 63. 25) of unknown location.

The name of the river Tigris the Greeks took from the Persian form (OPers. acc. *Tigrām*).<sup>1</sup> Herodotus has *Τίγρης*, acc. *Τίγρην*, while Xenophon, Arrian, Pausanias, etc., have *Τίγρης*, *Τίγρητος*, with transfer to the *τ*-type. Cf. *Πίγρης*, gen. Ion. *Πίγρην*, but Att. *Πίγρητος* (above, p. 184). The form *Τίγρις* in Strabo, Plutarch, Ptolemaeus, etc., was favored by the current popular etymology (cf. Curt. 4. 9. 16), connecting the name with the Persian word for arrow (Avest. *tiγriš*).

The names *Λίγρης* and *Βάβρης* (Hdn. 2. 680. 14, 22) are doubtless foreign, but there is nothing to show whether they are geographical or personal.

6. *Personal names in -ās, -ātos, etc.*—The latest extension of the *τ*-inflection is to the proper names in *-ās*, and likewise to those in *-ῆς*, *-αῦς*, *-εῦς*, *-οῦς*, *-ῶς*, which are common in late times and normally show vowel inflection. Such forms as *Μεγᾶς*, *Μεγᾶτος*, *Δωρᾶς*, *Δωρᾶτος*, occur in great numbers in the Egyptian papyri. Cf. Mayser 253 ff., and, for those in *-οῦς*, *-οῦτος*, *-ῶς*, *-ῶτος*, etc., 274 ff. They are nowhere else so frequent, but examples occur also in inscriptions of Asia Minor, e.g., Pamph. gen. *Μελατᾶτος* (Lancoronski 1. No. 92), from Cilicia *Ἀπολλῶς*, *-ῶτος* (Heberdey, *Reisen in Kilikien* p. 76), and from Lycia *Ζωσιμᾶς*, *-ᾶτος*, *Ζωσιμοῦς*, *-οῦτος*,

<sup>1</sup> For the various Asiatic forms, cf. Hübschmann, *IF.* 16. 421.

'Αμαροῦς, -οὔτος, etc.<sup>1</sup> In Ionic inscriptions such names have assumed the δ-inflection, as Βιτᾶς, -ᾶδος, 'Αγαθοῦς, -οῦδος, etc. But the τ-forms represent an independent extension, not a phonetic variation.

## WORD-LIST

## WORDS IN -ᾶς, -ᾶτος AND IN -ης, -ητος

(Exclusive of those in -της, -τητος)<sup>2</sup>

Masculine substantives, unless otherwise indicated

- |                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Λάβης [p. 180.                  | 'Αγάθης inser. Pamph., Lancoron-       |
| Διάβης, ἀλλάβης Strabo [p. 178. | ski 1. No. 83 [p. 180.                 |
| Κίβης [p. 180.                  | ἰσθής, ἦ Hom.+ [p. 178.                |
| Λίβης Hom.+ [p. 177.            | Ναίης                                  |
| ἱππο- Luc.                      | γλοίης Hdn., Hesych., Et. M. [p.       |
| Σίβης [p. 179.                  | 178.                                   |
| Σίρβης [p. 186.                 | Δράκης [p. 180.                        |
| Βάγης [p. 184.                  | (Φέκης), gen. Φέκειτους inser. Pamph., |
| Τάγης [p. 184.                  | Lancoronski 1. No. 89 [p. 180.         |
| Μέγης [p. 179.                  | μύκης (Archil.+), μύκητος Ar.+ [p.     |
| ἀργής, ὁ, ἦ Hom.+ [p. 177.      | 178.                                   |
| Δίργης [p. 186.                 | Καυλομύκητες [p. 185.                  |
| Μόργης [p. 184.                 | Σύκης inser. Pisd., Lancoronski 2.     |
| Μόργητες [p. 185.               | No. 1 [p. 184.                         |
| Μίσγης [p. 185.                 | (Μεγάλης), gen. Μεγάλειους, also nom.  |
| Γύγης [p. 179.                  | Μλαιάλῃ, dat. Μλαιάλιτι inser.         |
| Τρύγης BCH. 33. 171 [p. 180.    | Pamph., Lancoronski 1. Nos.            |
| Μένδης [pp. 184, 186.           | 54, 75 [p. 180.                        |
| Τριτωνομένδητες [p. 185.        | Θάλης [p. 181.                         |
| *Εσδητες [p. 185.               | Κάλης [p. 186.                         |
| Ποδής [p. 181, n. 2.            | *Επιώλης = foll.                       |
| Πύδης [p. 186.                  | *Ηπιώλης Sophron 70 Kaibel [p. 179.    |
| *Ελέης [p. 186.                 | φάλης Ar., Theocr. [p. 178.            |
| θής Hom.+ [p. 176.              | Κεφάλης [p. 179, n. 3.                 |

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *CIG.* 3. p. 1120; *BCH.* 16. 213 ff.; Schulze, *Berl. phil. Woch.* 1893. 226; Kretschmer *KZ.* 33. 469; Thumb. *Griech. Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus* 232.

<sup>2</sup> Also exclusive of the late type of proper names in -ᾶς, -ᾶτος (cf. above, p. 186); and of those in -ης, -ητος which represent Egyptian names in the papyri (Mayser 274); further, of some names which show an occasional τ-form in late inscriptions or papyri, as 'Ερμής, 'Ηρακλής, etc. (cf. above, p. 183).

Proper names in -ης which are to be found in Pape's *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen* are usually cited without reference.

The ethnica are given in the plural form, for convenience in distinguishing them, even when the singular is in use, e.g., Κρήτες, not Κρής.

- βλής, ὁ, ἡ Hdn. [p. 175.  
 -βλής, ὁ, ἡ, and ὁ [pp. 174, 175.  
   ἀ- Hom.+  
   παρ- Manetho  
   κατα-, ὁ Hesych.  
   ἐπι-, ὁ Hom.+  
   συμ- Orph. Arg.  
   λιθο- Tzetz.  
   Διο- Schol. Pind.  
   κεραυνο- Theophr.  
   ἀσπιδασ- Ar.  
   προ- Hom.+  
   ἀστρο- Aristot.  
   νιφο- Anth. P.  
   πολυ- Apoll. Lex. Hom.  
 Βάμβλης [p. 184.  
 Κάμβλης [p. 184.  
 Μάμβλης [p. 186.  
 \*Ορβλήτες inser. Pisid. Lancoronski  
   2. No. 15 [p. 185.  
 Γλῆτες, Ἰγλῆτες [p. 185.  
 \*Αγγέλης IG. 12. 1. 764 [pp. 180, 183.  
 κέλης Hom.+ [p. 177.  
   μονο- epigr. ap. Paus. (μονο-),  
   Tzetz.  
   ἐπακτρο- Aeschin., Aristot.  
 Κέλης [p. 179.  
 \*Ακέλης [p. 186.  
 Μέλης [pp. 179, 180, 186.  
 \*Αμέλης [p. 185.  
 Τέλης [pp. 179, 180, 181.  
 \*Αχέλης [p. 186.  
 δηλής Hdn. [p. 178.  
 Μήλης [p. 186.  
 μάσθλης, μάσλης Sappho+ [p. 178.  
   τροπο- Luc.  
 Τρεμίλης [p. 184.  
 ψιλής Aesch. [p. 177.  
 συγκλής, ἡ IG. 9. 2. 517. 10 [pp. 175,  
   176.  
 Φέλλης [p. 184.  
 Πώλλης [p. 180.  
 Μώλης (Μώλης) [p. 184.  
 \*Οπλης [pp. 179, 184.  
 \*Οπλήτες [pp. 177, 185.  
 δασπλής Simon.+ [p. 176.  
 Μώλης [p. 179.  
 ἄμης Ar.+ [p. 178.  
 Ζάμης [p. 186.  
 Κάμης [p. 182.  
 -δμήs, ὁ, ἡ [p. 174.  
   α- Hom.+  
   νεο- h. Hom.+  
 Νέμητες [p. 185.  
 Χρέμης [p. 180.  
 -κμήs, ὁ, ἡ [pp. 174, 175.  
   ἀ- Hom.+  
   δουρι- Aesch.  
   νεο- Nic.  
   μεγαλο- Schol. Aesch.  
   ἀνδρο- Aesch.+  
   σιδηρο- Soph.  
   αὐτο- Opp.  
 Κόμης [p. 181.  
 Τρόμης [p. 180.  
 δάμμητες Hesych. [p. 178.  
 -τμήs, ὁ, ἡ [p. 174.  
   ἡμι- Manetho, Paul. Sil.  
   φλεβο- Hdn.  
   ιβν- Nonn.  
 \*Ἀδρύμης [p. 186.  
 κάνης Crates, Plut. [p. 178.  
 πλάνης Soph.+ [p. 177.  
   ψευδο- Eust.  
 Μάνης [pp. 180, 184.  
 Πάνης IG. 5. 2. 387 [p. 180.  
 Φάνης [pp. 179, 180, 181.  
 Γνήτης [p. 185, n. 1.  
 Μάγνης [p. 179.  
 Μάγνητες [p. 185.  
 Ἰγνητες [p. 185.  
 ἑτερόγνης Hdn. [pp. 175, 176.  
 Μόνης [pp. 179, 180.  
 ἑμίνης Hdn. [p. 178.  
 Θειομένηs [p. 179, n. 3.  
 πόνης, ὁ and ὁ, ἡ Soph.+ [p. 177.  
   συμ- Greg. Naz.  
   περιμργο- Hesych.  
   νεο- A.B. 52.  
   φιλο- Jo. Chrys.

- θής, ὁ, ἡ [pp. 174, 175.  
 ἡμι- Ar., Thuc.+  
 νεο- Plato  
 χειμο- Luc.  
 λιμο- Aesch.  
 ἀνδρο- Aesch.  
 γυμνής Tyrtaeus.+ [p. 177.  
 Φρόνης JHS. 33. 313 [p. 180.  
 λιπερνής, ὁ, ἡ Archil.+ [p. 178.  
 χερνής, ὁ, ἡ Eur.+ [p. 176.  
 Κύνης [p. 180.  
 Κύνητες [p. 185.  
 Μύνης [p. 184.  
 Τύνης [p. 186.  
 γόνης Hdt.+ [p. 177.  
 ἀρχι- Greg. Naz.  
 μσο- Luc. (nom. only)  
 δορυσσόνης, ὁ, ἡ Soph. [p. 178.  
 τάτης Hom.+ [p. 178.  
 ἀμφι- Alexis+  
 τυλο- Euseb. in Ps. (Th.)  
 Τάρπητες [p. 185.  
 ἐρπής Hipp.+ [pp. 177, 179.  
 Ἄρης [p. 185.  
 Καβάρης [p. 186.  
 Δάρης [p. 184.  
 Φάρητες [p. 185.  
 Ἄφάρης Bacch. 5. 129 [p. 179.  
 Χάρης [pp. 180, 181, 185.  
 Βάβρης [p. 186.  
 Φάγρης [p. 186.  
 Νίγρης [p. 186.  
 Νίγρητες [p. 185.  
 Πίγρης [pp. 181, 184.  
 Τίγρης [p. 186.  
 Βέρης [pp. 184, 186.  
 Γέρης [p. 180.  
 ὑψικέρης Hdn. [p. 178.  
 Κέρητες [p. 185.  
 Ὑπέρης [p. 179.  
 Φέρης [pp. 179, 180.  
 Χέρης [p. 180.  
 εὐκράϊρης, ὁ, ἡ Maxim. [p. 178.  
 -κράς, ὁ, ἡ [pp. 174, 176.  
 ἀλι- Hdn.  
 μελι- Theod., Choerob.  
 νεο- Aesch.+  
 χαλκο- Hdn.  
 ἰσο- Hdn.  
 μελισσο- Hesych.  
 γαλακτο- Hdn.  
 αὐτό- Poll.  
 εὖ- Eur.+  
 Κρήτες [p. 185.  
 Ἐτεό- [p. 185, n. 3.  
 ἡμι- Lyc. [p. 185, n. 3.  
 Νεό- [p. 185, n. 3.  
 Σμίκρης [p. 180.  
 Κόρης [p. 180.  
 βέρρης Hesych. [p. 177.  
 -τρής, ὁ, ἡ [p. 174.  
 ἡμι- Hdn.  
 ἀμφι- Soph.+  
 Κύρης [p. 186.  
 δούρης Hdn. [p. 177.  
 κοῦρητες Hom.+ [p. 177.  
 Κούρης  
 Κουρήτες [p. 185.  
 πρωτοκούρης Gr. inscr. Brit. Mus. 3.  
 2. p. 219 [p. 185, n. 2.  
 μούρης Hdn. [p. 178, n. 1.  
 Πύρης [p. 181.  
 Φρήτες [p. 185.  
 Κωρήτες = Κουρήτες  
 σής (Pind.+), σητός Men.+ [p. 178.  
 Μάσσης, Μάνσσης [p. 185.  
 Πάσσης [p. 180.  
 Ναρσής [p. 184.  
 Κράτης [pp. 179, 180, 181.  
 Κότης [p. 184.  
 ἀπτής = ἀπτώς Inscr. v. Ol. 164 [p. 175.  
 Γύης [p. 184.  
 Μύης [p. 185.  
 Κάχης [p. 186.  
 Λάχης [pp. 179, 180.  
 πάχης, ὁ, ἡ Hesych.+ [p. 178.  
 Πάχης [p. 179.  
 ἔχης Et. M. [p. 177.  
 Τύχης IG. 14. 2011 [p. 180.  
 Ζώγης, gen. Ζώγειτος inser. Pamph.,  
 Lancoronski 1. No. 84 [pp. 180,  
 183.

## NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

### A SUPPOSEDLY RHODIAN INSCRIPTION RE-EXAMINED

In the *American Journal of Philology* for 1908, pp. 461 ff., Mr. T. Leslie Shear published, under the title "A New Rhodian Inscription," a vase of pottery in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York. The dealer from whom this vase was bought testified that it was found on the island of Rhodes, and his statement receives some confirmation from the resemblance of this piece to other pieces known to have that origin. In 1886 Fürtwängler, in publishing a number of specimens in Berlin (*Jahrb d. arch. Inst.*, I, 152); assigned them on the evidence of associated objects to the end of the fifth and the beginning of the fourth century B.C. In default of more exact evidence this has to serve as indicating the approximate date of the vase in the Metropolitan Museum.

This vase is simply decorated with painted horizontal bands and has in addition two painted inscriptions. On the one side are the names of four divinities: Δεὸς, Ἑρμῆς, Ἀρταμῆς, Ἀθαναΐα. On the other side is the inscription to be discussed in this note, viz.,

ΚΑΛΔΙΣΤΑΓΑΣΗΒΡΑΣΙΑ  
ΗΟΣΕΜΙΝΔΟΚΕΙ

This, regarded by Mr. Shear as an irregular iambic trimeter, in spite of the spondee as the second foot and the hiatus before ὦς, is read by him, καλλίστα γὰς ἡ Βρασία ὥς ἐμὴν δοκεῖ, and translated, "the Brasian region is the fairest in the land in my opinion." (The Brasii are known from several Rhodian inscriptions as a deme of Lindus. Their village must have been called Brasos, or something of the sort.)

The alphabet of the foregoing inscriptions is Ionic, except that the sign <sup>\*</sup>H is used for the rough breathing. This exception is surprising, if the vase is Rhodian, for in other Rhodian inscriptions of the fifth century—not numerous, to be sure—H has the value of η and the rough breathing is not indicated. So, e.g., in the incised verse on a late black-figured vase found at Camirus and now in the British Museum (*IG*, XII, 719): Φιλὸς ἦμι τὰς καλὰς ἡ κύλιξ ἡ ποικίλα. The circumstance throws some doubt on the Rhodian origin of the vase. May it not be Boeotian? The use of the form Λ instead of Λ would in an epoch of transition from the local Boeotian alphabet to the Ionic create no serious difficulty (cf. *IG*, VII, 2899).

But whether the vase be Rhodian or not, I cannot accept Mr. Shear's interpretation of the inscription. The supposed sentiment, surprising in



itself, belongs to an order of ideas otherwise unrepresented among vase inscriptions. Apart from that, I submit that, given the words *καλλίστα γῆς ἡ Βρασία*, the natural translation, the almost inevitable translation, would be "The Brasian woman is the fairest on earth." This, besides being the obvious meaning of the words, would bring the inscription into line with innumerable inscriptions on Attic pottery of the sixth and fifth centuries—inscriptions of the type *ὁ παῖς καλός, ἡ παῖς καλή, ὁ δαῖνα καλός, ἡ δαῖνα καλή*. Klein's *Griechische Vasen mit Lieblingsinschriften* supplies still closer parallels. Thus we find two youths, Andrias and Hippocritus, acclaimed each as *κάλλιστος*. And there are several instances of *δοκεῖ* in this class of inscriptions, e.g., *Catalogue of Vases in the British Museum*, Vol. III, E 718: *Ἀφροδισία καλή, τῶς δοκεῖ Εἰχ(ε)ίρω*. Other instances may be found on pp. 39, 61, 98 of Klein's *Liebingsinschriften* and on p. 50 of his *Meistersignaturen*.

In short, I am convinced that the vase painter meant to celebrate a woman, not a small piece of country. But that he would refer to her as the "the Brasian woman" rather than by her individual name does not seem very likely. If it be suggested that her name was Brasia, the objection is that the article is never used with a proper name in this class of inscriptions. I propose, therefore, to see in *HABPAΣΙΑ* a single word, Habrasia. This, though unexampled, seems to be possible as a woman's name, compounded of *ἄβρ*— and *Ἀσία*. A place-name does sometimes occur as the second element of a personal name, and *Ἀβρασία* looks as intelligible as *Ἀριστόκλυπος*.

Mr. Shear translates *γῆς* by "land," whereas I prefer to take it as "earth," but his understanding of the construction is the same as mine. Parallels are quoted by Krüger, *Griechische Sprachlehre*, I, 47, 29, A 7; viz., Plato, *Protag.* 342 A: *σοφισταὶ πλείστοι γῆς ἐκεῖ εἰσιν*, and Xenophon, *Symp.* VIII, 40: *σῶμα ἀξιοπερίστατον ἰδεῖν τῆς πόλεως ἔχεις*.

F. B. TARBELL

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

#### ON THE DATE AND ORDER OF DELIVERY OF ST. AUGUSTINE'S TRACTATES ON THE GOSPEL AND EPISTLE OF ST. JOHN

M. Péronne (*Œuvres complètes de Saint Augustin* [Paris, 1869], IX, 212 ff.; X, 452), dates these discourses in the year 416 or 417 A.D. It is certain from the content of the various sermons that they were delivered in the midst of the struggle between the Catholics and the Donatists. They might therefore be placed as far back perhaps as the year 411, just preceding the famous conference at Carthage between Catholic and Donatist bishops. In Tractates XLV, XLVIII, LXXXIII, CV, CXI, not only the doctrine of predestination, but also the errors of the Pelagians are discussed. Now the Pelagian heresy began to make its way into Africa about 411 A.D., and for that reason these sermons cannot be placed before that date.

The following statement from Tractate CXX would make it clear that a date later than 415 is to be assumed: "Hic ergo intelligendum est ad Iesum, non tunc solum, sed tunc primum venisse Nicodemum; venitisse autem postea ut fieret audiendo discipulus; quod certe modo in revelatione corporis beatissimi Stephani fere omnibus gentibus declaratur." The discovery of the bodies of Nicodemus and St. Stephen was made at the close of 415 A.D. Besides, at the end of Augustine's work *De trinitate* (XV, 27 [48]), Augustine quotes from one of the last sermons on the Gospel of St. John (XCIX, 8, 9). The *De trinitate* was finished in or after 416. The date 416-17 for this series of sermons, therefore, is the earliest probable date.

M. Péronne says also that these discourses were delivered "tous les jours sans distinction." This statement, however, cannot be accurate, if it is intended to indicate immediately successive days. Thus Sermons I and II were preached on Sunday (note II, 1) and Monday (II, 1, 2), respectively; and Sermons VII, VIII, IX, X, XI, XII in close succession on Sunday (VII, 24), Monday (VIII, 1, 13), Tuesday (VIII, 9, 13), Wednesday (X, 11, 12), Sunday (XIII, 1), and Monday (XII, 1), respectively. Thus under the closest possible successive arrangement, allowing a separate day for each sermon, one day remains unoccupied between Sermons II and VII, and three days between Sermons X and XI. Sermons XXXIV, XXXV, XXXVI, and XXXVII took place on successive days, on Thursday, Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, as we learn from the following passages: XXVIII, 1; XXXVII, 1, 6; XXXVI, 3; XXXV, 1. Sermons XLV and XLVI also were delivered on a Saturday and the following Sunday respectively (XLVII, 1; XLVI, 1).

The particular days of the week cannot be ascertained for any other sermons than those above mentioned, but certain homilies can be linked together as occurring on immediately successive days. Such are the sermon groups XV (note sec. 1) and XVI; XVII and XVIII (sec. 1); XIX (sec. 1, 20), XX (sec. 13), XXI (sec. 1), XXII (sec. 1, 11), and XXIII (sec. 3, 6, 15); XXIV and XXV (sec. 1); XXVIII and XXIX (sec. 1); XXXVIII (sec. 8); and XXXIX; XLIX and L (sec. 1); and LI and LII (sec. 1, 12).

All homilies which have been mentioned so far precede LIII. Beginning with LIV, the sermons become more compact in thought, and sharply reduced in length to about one-third of the average previous sermon. Furthermore, the day of the week of no single sermon from LIV to the end can be learned, and no two sermons can be joined with certainty as occurring on immediately successive days. Definite phrases in the first group of sermons (I-LIII) which refer specifically to the preceding or immediately following sermon, such as *praeterito die dominico, hesterno die, hesternam sermonem, in crastinum, crastino die*, etc. (*loc. cit.*) give way in the second group (LIV-CXXIV) on the one hand to such indefinite words as *pristino sermone* (LXXI, 1; LXXII, 1; LXXIII, 2; XCVIII, 8), and *praeterito sermone* (LXI, 1; XCVII, 2), where reference is always made to the immediately preceding verses of the Gospel, and on the other hand to *sermone alio* (XCVII, 5; CV, 8; CVI, 7; CVIII, 5;

CXII, 6; CXVI, 9; CXX, 9), *alia disputatione* (CIX, 5; CXV, 5), *ab alio exordio* (CXIII), and *alias* (CXVIII, 5), where reference is always made to the sermon directly following. This sudden and continued departure in the method of referring to immediately preceding and following sermons seems to indicate greater lapse of time between the several sermons of the second group than between those of the first group.

In XLVII, 9, Augustine says: "Fratres, quaeramus hoc paulo attentius. Non nos at artat horaque solet die dominico." From this statement it seems reasonable to believe that the brevity of the sermons of the second group is due to their being given regularly on Sundays and special feast-days, under the definite limitations of the holyday service. However, Augustine may also have come to realize that he was at times tiresome to his audience, and may have consented to shorten his sermons for that reason.

The ten tractates on the Epistle of St. John were delivered during a break in the service on the Gospel of St. John, as we learn from the beginning of the first of these ten sermons. Some manuscripts cut off the beginning of this first sermon as a *prologus* to the entire series. This, however, does not seem justifiable since Augustine in I, 5, refers back to the so-called *prologus* as to the beginning of his sermon: "Mementote in principio sermonis nostri, quia Epistola ista caritatem commendat." From internal evidence the following sermons on the Epistle occurred on successive days: I and II (note sec. 3); III, IV (sec. 1, 2), V (sec. 1), and VII; and IX and X (sec. 1). According to the authors of certain ancient manuscripts, II and III were given on the second and third day, respectively, of Easter Week. If so, the groups of I and II, and III-VII may be joined as a series of daily sermons.

M. Péronne (*loc. cit.*) places the delivery of these tractates directly after Tractate XI of the series on the Gospel of St. John. He does this for the most part on the basis of the opening words of Sermon XV, which show clearly a special effort to brush up the memory of his hearers on matters dropped a considerable time before. These sermons on the Epistle, in length and general character, do appear to belong to the first group of the sermons on the Gospel (I-LIII). At any rate, the discourses on the Epistle form a cognate part or episode in the series on the Gospel.

Thus Sermons I-LIII on the Gospel were given nearly every day, and are characterized by their greater length (cf. VI, a sermon of 5,500 words which probably took an hour for delivery). Ten sermons on the Epistle of St. John seem to have been given as an interruption of this group, perhaps at Sermon XI. No two sermons of the second group (LIV-CXXIV) appear to have been delivered on immediately successive days. Moreover, they are characterized by marked brevity and compactness of thought, and may have been given on holydays and Sundays only.

At the very beginning of VI, Augustine refers to the weather as being extremely cold. This statement, together with certain remarks during the course of the sermons, places the commencement of the delivery of these

tractates at the end of 416 A.D. The great number of the sermons (134 in all), as well as the likelihood that a good portion of them were not delivered on successive days, leads us to believe that they were extended over the major part of 417 and possibly into 418 A.D.

ROY J. DEFERRARI

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

#### VARIA TOPOGRAPHICA

*The Basilica Opimia.*—In 121 B.C. L. Opimius erected a basilica near the temple of Concord, which stood until it was removed by Tiberius in 10 A.D. Cicero in his oration for Sestius (140) contrasts the reputation of those Romans who have roused their fellow-citizens to revolt and sedition with that of those who have used their influence to check such uprisings, and writes: "ac ne quis ex nostro aut aliquorum praeterea casu hanc vitae viam pertimescat, unus in hac civitate, quem quidem ego possum dicere, praeclare vir de re publica meritus, L. Opimius, indignissime concidit; cuius monumentum celeberrimum in foro sepulchrum desertissimum in litore Dyrrachio relictum est." The meaning of *celeberrimum*, "much frequented," is perfectly clear, but not only have translators often fallen into error (cf. Bohn, "superb monument"), but Hülsen misses the point and makes this passage his authority for the following statement (*Forum*<sup>2</sup>, 13): "Opimius erbaute . . . eine Basilica die . . . als stattliches Monument gerühmt wird: was, da der Bauplatz nur klein gewesen sein kann, wohl auf prachtvolle Ausstattung schliessen lässt." We may wonder that Hülsen was caught napping, and still more that both his French and his English translators perpetuate the error. Carcopino even quotes the Latin words. In this way is the old basilica made over into a stately edifice!

*Elephas herbarius.*—The last monument mentioned in the *Regionary Catalogue* in region VIII is *Elephas herbarius*, which from its place in the list probably stood near the foot of the Capitoline, in the modern piazza Montanara. There is no other reference to the monument in antiquity, but the name was preserved during the Middle Ages as a local designation in the title of the Church of S. Abbaciro ad Alafantum. It was undoubtedly a bronze statue of an elephant, comparable with the *elephantes aenei* on the Sacra Via, which are mentioned by Cassidorus (*Varia* 30), but the epithet *herbarius* has proved a stumbling-block for topographers. Becker (601) hazards no conjecture, but simply says: "der so wenig mit dem Forum Olitorium gemein hat als *herbae* und *olera* gleichbedeutend sind." Preller (154) remarks: "Der Beiname *herbarius* mag auf einem besondern Umstande beruhen; sonst hiessen *animalia herbatica* oder *herbaria* grassfressende Thiere." Jordan (I, 2, 476) calls it *Krautelephant*, and comments thus: "Der Beiname *herbarius* sollte allerdings wie bei Hercules olivarius und Apollo sandaliarius auf der Nähe eines Geschäfts von *herbarii* weisen.

Allein ein solches Gewerbe ist nicht nachweisbar, sicher nur dass es nichts mit *holera* des Forum holitorium gemein haben könnte. Die Sache bleibt dunkel." Jordan did not notice that the analogy between Apollo sandaliarius, Hercules olivarius, and this is only superficial after all, for in the case of deities entirely other considerations may enter into the explanation of epithets.

Hülsem says (*RE*, V, 2525): "Den Beinamen *herbarius* darf man natürlich weder mit der *holera* des Forum holitorium noch mit einem Gewerbe von *herbarii* in Verbindung bringen; es heisst wohl einfach der zahme." This looks as if Hülsem thought that wild elephants were carnivorous! Armellini (564) derives the name from a neighboring market of *herbae*, of which we know nothing, and Richter (191) says that it gave its name to a *vicus* in which the dealers in *herbae* carried on their trade. Gilbert (III, 418) thinks that it was connected with the Forum holitorium, which is altogether improbable.

So there is much obscurity developed about a perfectly simple thing, of which, to be sure, Becker, as so often, had given a hint—a statue of an elephant eating grass, a most natural and suggestive pose. For this use of *herbarius* in imperial times we may compare two inscriptions: (*CIL*, VI, 10209) Aurel. Sabinus Aug. lib. praepositus herbariarum, that is, the superintendent of the *animalia herbaria* that were used in the Colosseum; (*NS*, 1899, 149) M. Rebilus Macedo . . . feris n. IIII ursis XVI noxeis III et ceteris herbariis, of a show given at Beneventum.

*Thermae Hiemales*.—A passage in the *Vita Aureliani* (45) reads: *thermas in transtiberina regione facere paravit hiemales, quod aquae frigidioris copia illic deesset*; that is, Aurelian proposed to build some baths, *thermae hiemales*, in Trastevere because there was no sufficient supply of *aqua frigidior*, evidently water that was colder than that required for *thermae hiemales*.

Hülsem translates *Kaltbad*, and thus falls into a double error, first of neglecting to observe that the reason given has no sense if this is the kind of bath intended, and second of supposing that *hiemales thermae* can mean cold baths. There is no parallel for any such use of *hiemales*. The use of the word in Pliny (xviii. 69): "*totis hoc Alpibus notum et hiemalibus provinciis nullum hoc frumento laetius [triticum]*," is no real exception, for here it is precisely equivalent to our own "wintry." Furthermore, there is no case of any such expression as *thermae frigidae*, although we cannot say that *thermae* had so far retained its original signification as to make such a usage impossible.

Of *aestivus, aestivalis*, with *thermae* we have these cases from the later period: *CIL*, X, 5348, an inscription from Interamna: "*opera thermarum estivalium restituit*"; *Vit. Gordiani*, 32, 7: "*cogitaverat praeterea cum Mithreo ut post basilicam thermas aestivas sui nominis faceret, ita ut hiemales in principio porticum poneret, intus essent vel viridaria vel porticus*." In these two cases *hiemalis* and *aestivalis* are clearly opposite in meaning, namely, for use in winter and for use in summer. In the trans-Tiberine

district there was not sufficient water available of a temperature cool enough for summer use. Two aqueducts supplied this region, the Alsietina built by Augustus to feed his *naumachia*, and the Traiana, built by Trajan to supply drinking-water. The first brought water from Lake Martignano, the second from springs. Severus had already constructed baths in this region, and it is quite clear that no further demands could be made on the cold spring water of the Traiana.

*The Porta Romana or Romanula.*—According to Varro there were three gates in the wall of the original Palatine city, and that on the northwest corner of the hill was called Romanula—*ab Roma dictam* (LL., V, 164). Festus (262) says: "Appellata autem Romana a Sabinis praecipue quod ea proximus aditus erat Romam." There is little doubt that Romana is the proper form, and the explanation of the name is the problem which confronts us. So far as we know, the gates of Latin cities were frequently named after the towns on the roads that ran out of them, or after the roads themselves. Compare the familiar examples, p. Praenestina, Collatina, Ardeatina, Ostiensis, etc., in Rome, and the p. Esquilina in Tibur. Other gates in Rome were named after local designations of sections of the city, as Collina, Pinciana; still others, of course, bore names of different significance, but, so far as I know, we have no other case like Porta Romana, where the name of the town itself is given to a gate.

Against any hesitation on this ground, however, is Varro's direct testimony—*ab Roma dictam*—and if he saw nothing unusual, or at least impossible, in such usage, why should we? But we cannot, unfortunately, follow this simple rule in dealing with Varro, and Festus seems to hint that such an explanation was not satisfactory to all Romans. He, at least, draws a little nearer to the apparent practice when he says that the name was given by the Sabines to the gate through which they found their nearest approach. We do not know the source from which Festus draws here, but the explanation seems to be an infelicitous attempt to avoid the Varronian view. Certainly it does not appear probable that this was the true origin of the name.

In the good old days when we could connect Roma with *ruma*, *rumon*, "a stream," it was easy to explain the name of the gate, for it would be altogether natural to call that nearest the river the river-gate. But now that Schulze has made his theory so fashionable that everybody says without hesitation that Rome got its name from an Etruscan clan, the case is different. Kretschmer a few years ago (*Glotta*, I, 295, n. 2) wrote as follows: "Da Tore nach den Oertlichkeiten zu heissen pflegen, in deren Nähe sie liegen oder führen, so dürfte die Porta Romana das Tor gewesen sein das nach Rom führte. Dann kann natürlich die alte Stadt auf dem Palatin, die sogenannte Roma quadrata, ursprünglich nicht den Namen Rom getragen haben, sie wird vielmehr Palatium geheissen haben, und der Name Roma muss dann ursprünglich an der Oertlichkeit westlich vom Palatin (später Velabrum, eventuell



auch Forum und Capitol) gehaftet haben und ist, als diese Ansiedlung mit der Palatinstadt verwuchs, auf das Ganze übertragen worden."

Now the idea of a settlement in the swampy Velabrum or Forum in early times is quite preposterous, and I do not mean to assert that Kretschmer insists on a settlement in *Oertlichkeit*, but if there had been a village on the Capitoline which was called Roma, some trace of the transfer of the name to the Palatine would surely be found in tradition. Such a transfer would have resulted, normally, from causes that would have found some reflection in later times. Some support for this view might possibly be found in Festus' statement, were it not for the difficulty of explaining how a Sabine settlement came to have an Etruscan name—although, to be sure, one might ask whether there was any greater difficulty here than in giving an Etruscan name to a Latin settlement—and for the fact that it implies a complete reversal of the traditional place occupied by the Capitoline in Roman tradition, a reversal that demands more effective support than this hypothesis affords. If Schulze's view is true, why can we not explain the Porta Romana most easily by supposing that this powerful Etruscan clan, or family, dwelt at this northwest corner of the hill—where tradition puts the first settlement—and that the gate, as well as the whole inclosure, got its name from this fact? I cannot cite any exact parallel, but it seems a more plausible explanation than to derive the name of the gate directly from that of the city.

SAMUEL BALL PLATNER

#### TACITUS *AGRICOLA* 44.1

*Agricola* 44.1 states: "excessit [Agricola] . . . Collega Priscoque consulibus." All the manuscripts<sup>1</sup> give the name of the consul in the form "Prisco," and the editors of the *Agricola* have unanimously followed them. A few<sup>2</sup> have called attention to the fact that there was some inscriptional evidence<sup>3</sup> for "Priscinus" as the name of the consul. One editor, K. Tücking, goes so far as to say, "Statt Prisco ist wohl zu lesen Priscino"; he does not, however, introduce "Priscino" into his text.<sup>4</sup> Recently Liebenam, in his

<sup>1</sup> C. Annibaldi, *L'Agricola e La Germania di Cornelio Tacito* (Citta di Castello, 1907), p. 105, shows that the reading of E is "Prisco," and does not point out any other reading in his comparisons with the other manuscripts. See, too, the edition by Katherine Allen and G. L. Hendrickson (Boston, 1913), p. 117.

<sup>2</sup> H. Furneaux (Oxford, 1898), p. 161, note 5; A. Gudeman, edition of *Agricola* and *Germania* (Boston, 1900), p. 145; A. Draeger's edition revised by W. Heraeus (published by Teubner, 1905), note on the passage 44. 1.

<sup>3</sup> J. Klein, *Fasti Consulares* (Leipzig, 1881), p. 50, gave Priscinus as the correct name. He was followed by J. Asbach, "Fasti Consulares" in *Bonner Jahrbücher*, LXXIX (1885), 125, and D. Vaglieri, in *De Ruggiero*, II, 1060. The evidence for the name Priscinus was found on two brief non-official inscriptions in *Annali dell' Inst.*, XLII (1870), 185, Nos. 196 and 197.

<sup>4</sup> K. Tücking, edition of *Agricola* (Paderborn, 1890), p. 71.

*Fasti*,<sup>1</sup> and B. Stech<sup>2</sup> have preferred "Priscus" as the proper form, although they admit the possibility of "Priscinus."

The problem can now be definitely solved by the evidence from an inscription first published in 1910. This inscription, which is an official record of certain grants to soldiers, gives, as the names of the consuls of 93, "Sex. Pompeio Collega. Q. Peducaeo Priscino."<sup>3</sup> It is certain, therefore, that the second consul's name was not "Priscus" but "Priscinus."

There is then evidently an error in the reading of the *Agricola*, "Collega Priscoque"; and that error is an early one, for even E, the oldest manuscript and the source of all the rest, has this reading.<sup>4</sup> It is an error easy to understand, since the dropping out of "in" leaves still a Roman cognomen, and one much more common than "Priscinus." Possibly the error is due to abbreviation; "Priscino" might have been written "Prisc."<sup>5</sup>

It might be claimed that, since the manuscripts are at one in the reading "Prisco," the mistake is not that of a copyist, but of the author, Tacitus. Under the circumstances, however, this seems unlikely. Priscinus, as consul ordinarius in 93, must have been a man of some note, with whom Tacitus may well have been acquainted. Tacitus himself was a man in high station at the time; he had been praetor not long before, and was soon to be consul. Moreover, the *Agricola* was written only five years after the consulship of Priscinus.

G. A. HARRER

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

#### A SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY PARODY OF CATULLUS 4

There has recently come into my possession a duodecimo vellum-bound volume from the library of the Rt. Rev. George W. Doane, bishop of New Jersey from 1832 to 1859. The title-page pictures two cavaliers paying homage to a pedestaled ass, and bears the title: *Laus Asini tertia parte auctor: cum aliis festiuis opusculis. . . . Lugd. Batavorum, Ex Officina Elzeviriana. Anno MDCXXIX*. No author's name is given, but the catalogue of the British Museum (which lists four copies of this edition) assigns the book to Daniel Heinsius, beloved pupil of Scaliger, friend of

<sup>1</sup> *Fasti Consulares* (Bonn, 1909), p. 17.

<sup>2</sup> *Senatores Romani* (Leipzig, 1912), p. 63, No. 789. Rohden, *Prosopographia*, III, 96, Nos. 707 and 709, is quite uncertain.

<sup>3</sup> *AE* (1910), 75, *Bulletin de la Société Archéol. d'Alexandrie* (1910), pp. 39 ff. See also Mitteis-Wilcken, *Papyrusurkunde*, I. Hist. Theil, II. Hälfte, Chrestomathie, pp. 546 ff., col. III, l. 7, and L. Cantarelli in *Bull. Commiss. Archéol. Comun.*, XXXVIII (1910), 340 ff.

<sup>4</sup> See C. Annibaldi, *loc. cit.*

<sup>5</sup> A good example is found in the case of this very man. *CIL*, XI, 6689, 20, gives: "Ampl. Coll. et Prisc. eos."

Johannes Dousa and Paulus Merula, and for half a century professor and librarian in the University of Leyden. It is attributed to Heinsius by the writers of the *Nouvelle Biographie Générale*<sup>1</sup> and the *Biographie Universelle*,<sup>2</sup> as well as by Foppens<sup>3</sup>—all evidently following the *Athenae Batavae*<sup>4</sup> of Johannes Meursius, which includes the *Laus Asini* among the works of Heinsius.

The little book introduces the reader at once to the learned circle of the University of Leyden in the early seventeenth century. It is dedicated to Ewald Schrevel, professor of medicine, and to his colleague Adolph Vorst, son of the eminent physician Aelius-Everhard Vorst, and successor of his father as professor of botany and director of the Botanical Garden. Besides the satire which gives the book its name, and several shorter essays, the volume contains *epistolae*, one addressed *viro clarissimo Hugoni Grotio*, another *Dominico Baudio*, and seven pages of *iambi* to Baudius on the death of his wife.

But to the classical student, the most interesting part of the book is the poem of twenty-six lines in iambic verse, inserted between the preface and the table of contents, with the title: *Parodia Phaseli Catulliani, in Asini expressam hic effigem*:

Asellus ille, quem videtis, hospites,	
ait fuisse quadrupes pigerrimus,	
nec ullius stupentis ocium pecu	
nequisse praeterire, sive Inertiae	
opus foret litare, sive Murciae.	5
et hoc negat feroculae Bataviae	
negare littus, insulasve proximas,	
Sicambriam, trucemque Baetici sinum.	
ubi iste, nunc screator, antea fuit	
iners asellus. heic Salaciae in solo	10
rudente saepe sibilum edidit sono.	
Bataviae ora, nobilisque Catta gens,	
tibi haec fuisse et esse cognitissima	
asellus inquit. ultima ex origine	
tuis natasse dicit in paludibus:	15
tuo imbuisse et ungulas in aequore.	
et inde per tot alta littorum iuga	
herum tulisse; laeva sive dextera	
foret cruenta: sive agaso verbere	
utrunque durus incidisset in latus.	20
nec ulla vota vapularibus diis	

<sup>1</sup> *Nouvelle Biographie Générale*, XXIII, 791-93.

<sup>2</sup> Michaud, *Biographie Universelle*, XIX, 64-66.

<sup>3</sup> *Bibliotheca Belgica*, I, 226-28 (Brussels, 1739).

<sup>4</sup> *Athenae Batavae, sive de Leidensis urbis antiquitatibus et viris claris, qui ingenio eam, aut scriptis, illustrarunt*, 1625.

sibi esse facta, cum veniret a mare  
 novissimo, hanc ad usque musicam domum.  
 sed haec prius fuere: nunc ineptiis  
 vacat iocisque. seque dedicat tibi,  
 gemelle asellule, et gemelle aselluli.<sup>1</sup>

25

The verses are reminiscent both of Catullus 4 and of the imitation which has come down to us among the minor poems of Vergil (*Catalepton* 10). The construction *quadrupes pigerrimus* (2) recalls *mulio celerrimus* of the *Catalepton*, rather than *navium celerrimus* of the original; but in other places Heinsius follows Catullus more closely than does the Vergilian parody (11 *rudente* . . . . *sono*; 16 *tuo* . . . . *aequore*; 18 *herum tulisse*; 18-20 *laeva* . . . . *latus*; 22 *cum veniret a mare*). In making the transpositions *asellus inquit* (14, for *ait phasellus*) he is of course governed by metrical necessity.

The ablative *mare* (22) and the form *ocium* (3), neuter singular, as if from a positive *ocius*,<sup>2</sup> betray the Latin of a period when morphology was not yet firmly established. The vocabulary, however, is distinctly classical and shows intimate acquaintance with Latin writers of every age. *Feroculus* (6) is described by Harper's *Lexicon* as "very rare" and quoted only from Turp. *Frag. Com.* 107 R<sup>3</sup> and *Auctor Bell. Afr.* 16. 1. *Screator* (9), "a hawk" is given in the *Lexicon* as occurring only in Plaut. *Mil. Glor.* 647, although *screo* is found in Plaut. *Curc.* 115, *screatus* in Ter. *Heaut.* 373, and the deponent *conscreeor* in Plaut. *Pers.* 308. The adjective *vapularis* (21) is likewise a comic ἀπαξ λεγόμενον, quoted from Plaut. *Pers.* 22. *Rudo* (11), a common verb for all animal noises (Verg. *Aen.* 7. 16 lions; *Georg.* 3. 374 stags), frequently describes the braying of an ass (Ov. *Ars Amat.* 3. 290; *Fast.* 1. 433; 6. 342; *Pers.* 3. 9). *Agaso* (19), familiar from Plautus (*Merc.* 852) and Horace (*Sat.* ii. 8. 72) denotes the driver of an ass in Apul. *Met.* 7. 18; 7. 25. *Salacia* (10), if it is used literally in the sense of Neptune's bride, may be borrowed from Varro *Ling. Lat.* 5. 72 M, or from Servius on Verg. *Georg.* 1. 31; *Aen.* 10. 76; or, if in the transferred sense of "the sea," from Pac. *Frag. Trag.* 418 R<sup>3</sup>.

The geographical list of lines 6 ff. is especially interesting. Catullus had followed the course of his yacht from Pontus, through the Thracian Propontis, past Rhodes, the Cyclades, and the coast of the Adriatic, *hunc ad usque limpidum lacum*. So, when the parodist mentions the shore of Batavia (Flanders), the near-by islands, Sicambria (the country of the Sugambri on the Rhine below Cologne; cf. *Caes. Bell. Gall.* 4. 16 ff.; *Hor. Carm.* 4. 2. 36; *Tac. Ann.* 2. 26; 12. 39), the *Catta gens* (i.e., the Chatti, who lived in the modern Hesse and Thuringia; cf. *Tac. Germ.* 29, 30), and

<sup>1</sup> The original spelling and punctuation are retained.

<sup>2</sup> Possibly due to a misunderstanding of passages like Verg. *Ecl.* 7. 8-9: "'ocius,' inquit, / 'huc ades, o Meliboe,'" or *Hor. Carm.* 2. 11.18-20: "quis puer ocius / res-tinguat ardentis Falerni / pocula praetereunte lymphæ?"

*Baetici sinus* (the bay of the Baetis, now the Guadalquivir, in Southern Spain?), he apparently traces in reverse order the journeyings of a Spanish donkey to his northern home.

CORNELIA C. COULTER

VASSAR COLLEGE

---

NOTE ON PLATO [?] *THEAGES* 124E

ΣΩ. Οὐκοῦν ταύτης ἐπιθυμῶν σὺ φῆς;

ΘΕ. Ἐοικέν γε ἐξ ὧν ἐγὼ εἶπον.

All editions accessible to me read *ἔοικε* or *ἔοικεν*. The true idiomatic reading should, I think, be *ἔοικά γε*, which expresses the slightly humorous surprised acceptance of the personal application of the argument. Similarly in *Euthydemus* 296C, when Socrates is convicted by the sophist of knowing all things, he replies, *ἔοικα*. In *Gorgias* 519E, when Callicles ironically says, "And you would be incapable of making a long speech," Socrates replies, *ἔοικά γε*. In *Cratylus* 407C, when Hermogenes is asked if he did not mean by Hephaestus τὸν γεναῖον τὸν "φάεος ἱστορα," he playfully accepts the absurd etymology with *ἔοικα*. Compare also *Alcibiades I* 112D, 116D, φαίνομαι ὡς *ἔοικα*, and, though less strictly relevant, *Politicus* 277D, *Apology* 21D, *Laws* 837E, and possibly Aristophanes *Ecclesiazousae* 146.

PAUL SHOREY

## BOOK REVIEWS

---

*Apuleius: The Golden Ass.* Being the *Metamorphoses* of Lucius Apuleius, with an English Translation by W. ADLINGTON, revised by S. GASELEE. (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. xxiv+608. New York: Macmillan, 1915.

In forming an estimate of a translation, one usually asks how accurately and sympathetically the original text has been turned into idiomatic English. Such an inquiry would be out of place here, for of course Adlington's translation is not an accurate rendering, and revising it with a view to making it accurate would require a complete change in its character. The problem which confronted Mr. Gaselee, therefore, was to keep as much of Adlington as can be kept without departing too far from the meaning of Apuleius, and the question narrowed itself down largely to a matter of personal taste and judgment, and to a matter of judgment for almost every sentence of the translation. Consequently, the reviewer, while expressing no opinion here about the wisdom of undertaking such a task, has not only kept in mind the nature of the revision aimed at, but he has also tried to make a generous allowance for the difference between his judgment in a given case and that of Mr. Gaselee. Any two scholars may disagree about the wisdom of changing some word or phrase in Adlington which does not properly convey the idea of the original; they may not agree on the propriety or wisdom of changing an expression in Adlington which is not strictly grammatical or idiomatic, because of course even Adlington nods now and then. But there are certain requirements which one who revises Adlington's translation may fairly be called upon to meet. It is easy to see what we may properly expect of him. He should not insert a word in the revision out of keeping with Adlington's English, or a word or phrase which leaves us with an awkward or unintelligible sentence. He ought to correct Adlington, where Adlington has radically misunderstood the meaning of Apuleius. He ought to omit from his revision a clause or sentence in Adlington which is not found in Apuleius, provided it can be omitted without doing violence to Adlington's English, and he should insert a translation of any Apuleian clause which Adlington has omitted.

In all these respects the revision is open to criticism in many places. Only a few illustrations of the points mentioned need be given here. To cite some cases of the first sort, on p. 35 Adlington's sentence is revised so as to read, "I am brought me to the gate of this city"; on p. 51, "os quoquoaversum



floridum," omitted by Adlington, is rendered "his blooming countenance in all points"; on p. 55 Gaselee revises Adlington's phrase "I was greatly delighted with the view of these things" to read, "I was greatly delighted with exploring the view of these things"; on the same page Apuleius' words "*ceteros omnes sermone secreto decedere praecipit*" appear in Adlington as "she willed secretly the residue to depart" and is revised to read, "she willed secretly the residue to depart from our secret conference"; on p. 59 we find in Adlington "with stirring and turning the same," in Gaselee "with such stirrings and turning the same"; on p. 63 the revision leaves us with an incomplete sentence, "O how well doth a fair colour and a brilliant sheen upon the glittering hair"! on p. 79 Adlington's "the Servitors waited orderly at the table in rich apparell" reads, "a crowd of servitors brought orderly the plentiful meats in rich apparel"; on p. 85 to Adlington's rendering "and am more quicke of sight than Lynx or Argus" is added "and must be all eyes," for the omitted phrase "*et oculos totum*"; on p. 89 "the Matron weeping with her witnesses" is made to read, "the matron all blubbered (= *flens*) with her witnesses"; on p. 49 stands the awkward and obscure revised sentence "the birds which I heard chirping, and the trees without the walls of the city, and the running waters were changed from men into such feathers and leaves and fountains."

In the way of mistranslations, it is difficult to see how the first sentence on p. 50 can be rendered as Gaselee translates it; on p. 54, in the phrase "*inter medias frondes lapidis Actaeon*," "*lapidis*" is not to be taken with "*frondes*" as Adlington and Gaselee take it, but with "*Actaeon*"; on p. 94 "*populum adorat*" means "addresses the people," not "made reverence unto the people," as Adlington and Gaselee translate the words; on the same page to render "*praesentem audaciam*" as "present audacity" is hardly correct; on p. 97 "being lively indeed, howbeit buried in sleep" misses the strong contrast intended in "*vivus quidem sed tum sopore mortuus*"; on p. 96 "*praemium non industriae, sed debilitationis consecutus*" means "after getting a recompense, not for his diligence but for his mutilation." Adlington had rendered the sentence with substantial accuracy "for lucre of a little money sustained losse of his members." Gaselee revises this to read, "for his diligence hath received no reward of money, but loss of his members." Of course Lucius did receive "a reward of money."

Two illustrations must suffice of cases where Gaselee has retained from Adlington clauses not found in Apuleius: on p. 87 Apuleius has nothing to correspond to "fell on the ground," and on p. 475 the sentence "there was no comfort in her, but continual weeping and sobbing" has been inserted by Adlington and should have been omitted in the revision. On the other hand, there are Apuleian phrases, like "*certus erroris*" on p. 163, which have been omitted by Adlington and could have been added in the revision, without breaking up the symmetry of Adlington's sentences. It is hard to understand at times how Adlington came to make omissions from the Apuleian

text or additions to it in his translation. We can understand why the prophet is made to put the magical herb "three times" (p. 93) on the lips of the dead man, although Apuleius speaks of only one application, but, for instance, why the entire sentence "Vos . . . perhibetote" (p. 84) or the two lines on p. 63 ("vel . . . aspectum") should have been omitted is not clear. The omitted passages have probably not been overlooked and are not generally difficult to understand. Perhaps we should be right in conjecturing that Adlington inserted or omitted phrases solely with a view to improve the style of the narrative.

Mr. Gaselee has shown excellent taste in retaining as much of the flavor of Adlington's version as possible. We question a little, however, the wisdom of not substituting "temple" for "church," on p. 251, and "comedy" for "fable" on p. 475, and of retaining such phrases as "committed this fact" (p. 91), "she had been stricken with some clap of thunder, with some storm" (p. 357), "an ass of arms" (p. 473), and "lapping up the end of the table-cloth into an heap" (p. 81). Perhaps one can best understand the nature of the changes which Mr. Gaselee has made in Adlington's version and appreciate the relation which the text of Apuleius, Adlington's translation, and Gaselee's revision bear to one another by glancing at a typical passage from the three books. Take, for instance, the sentence at the bottom of p. 86. In Apuleius it reads: "Terga vortit et cubiculo protinus exterminatur: nec mora, cum me somnus profundus in imum barathrum repente demergit, ut ne deus quidem Delphicus ipse facile discerneret, duobus nobis iacentibus, quis esset magis mortuus: sic inaninis et indigens alio custode paene ibi non eram." Adlington rendered this (see Whibley's reprint, p. 56): "Then incontinently she ran away, and when she was gon, I fell on the ground so fast asleepe, that Apollo himself could not discern whether of us two was the dead corps, for I lay prostrat as one without life, and needed a keeper likewise." In Gaselee's revision this sentence reads: "Then incontinently she ran away, and when she was quite gone from the chamber, I fell on the ground so fast in the deepest depth of sleep that Apollo himself could not well discern whether of us two was the dead corpse, for I lay prostrate as one without life, and needed a keeper likewise, and had as well not been there."

These misprints have been noticed: on p. 3, l. 15, "achieved" for "arrived"; on p. 41, l. 10, "it" omitted after "lay"; on p. 67, l. 26, "it" omitted after "now," and on p. 79, l. 21, "hits" for "pits." On pp. 94-95 the alignment is not accurate.

A revision of Adlington's translation called for the exercise of unusual care, and in closing this notice the reviewer feels compelled to express the opinion that Mr. Gaselee has taken his very difficult task too lightly.

FRANK FROST ABBOTT

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

*A Study of Archaism in Euripides.* By CLARENCE AUGUSTUS MANNING. New York: Columbia University Press, 1916. Pp. 98. \$1.25.

*The Chorus of Euripides.* By ARISTIDES EVANGELUS PHOUTRIDES. Harvard Studies in Classical Philology. Vol. XXVII, pp. 77-170, 1913.

Hermann Deckinger began his dissertation on *Die Darstellung der persönlichen Motive bei Aischylos und Sophokles* with the following words: "Ueber die Technik der griechischen Tragiker liegen bis jetzt nicht sehr viele Untersuchungen vor. Ausser gelegentlichen Hinweisen, die sich da und dort, besonders in den kommentierten Ausgaben, zerstreut finden, sind für dieses Gebiet vor allem zwei Arbeiten zu nennen, beide aus neuester Zeit: Adolf Gross, *Die Stichomythie in der griechischen Tragödie und Komödie* (1905), und Friedrich Leo, *Der Monolog im Drama* (1908)." If these words could be written by a German so recently as 1911, in what terms ought the indifference, not to say the unawareness, of American scholars with regard to these matters to be characterized? It is true that in the last few years not a few German monographs have been devoted to various phases of technique in Greek drama and that some response has been aroused in this country. Witness, for example, Stephenson's *Some Aspects of the Dramatic Art of Aeschylus* (1913). But this meritorious dissertation apparently caused never a ripple on the placid surface of aesthetic criticism and, so far as I have observed, enjoyed not so much as a single review! As an additional recruit, then, in the task of creating interest in this field on this side of the Atlantic Dr. Manning ought to receive our welcome.

Yet dramaturgy does not occupy the chief place in his dissertation, but figures most prominently in connection with the second half of chap. iii, "The Cause of the Entrance of the Chorus." Though this is a small matter, the fact that it is commonly ignored in our commentaries makes it worth investigating. The author finds that Aeschylus practically always provided his chorus with an entrance motive and that Sophocles frequently did not, at least not in the *parodos*. Euripides is more like Aeschylus in this, though his motivation is often trivial and unsatisfactory.

This section makes clear the meaning of Dr. Manning's title: the thesis develops the fact that in many particulars Euripides was more akin to Aeschylus than to Sophocles. Chapter i is entitled "The Structure of the Drama" and seeks to explain the absence of unity in many of Euripides' plays. When the tragedies in a *διδασκαλία* came to treat of utterly separate themes, there might be a tendency to put into each play enough material for a whole Aeschylean trilogy and for each to approximate the tragic form by being capable of a tripartite division. The author detects these developments especially in Sophocles' *Oedipus Coloneus* and in the plays of

Euripides' second period (430-416 B.C.). In the second chapter he cites Aeschylean precedents for Euripides' practice of including such extraneous matter in his prologues and epilogues, and partially corrects Krausse, *De Euripide Aeschyli Instauratore* (1905). Later on (p. 81), these conclusions are used to refute Verrall's theory that the prologue and the words of the *deus ex machina* are to be disregarded in interpreting Euripides' plays.

The first half of chap. iii and chap. v amplify the resemblances between Aeschylus and Euripides, as opposed to Sophocles, in the use of anapaests. In chap. vi it is maintained that, since trochaic tetrameter was the original meter of tragedy at a time when the characters were deities, it came to be used, except in Euripides' later pieces, to "mark the separation of human and divine and at the end of plays." Contrary to what one might expect, however, the tetrameter is associated with the human and the iambic with the divine. Until a satisfactory explanation for this reversal can be provided, the distinction must remain of doubtful value. The fact that in our earliest play there are human characters and iambics but no trochaics or divinities does not lessen the objection.

In chap. iv, "The Iambic Speeches of the Chorus," Euripides' choruses are found to express their opinions of actors and their conduct more clearly and boldly and to be more intimately related to some character than in Sophocles—another reversion to Aeschylean practice.

Chapters vii and viii consider the use which the three playwrights made of descriptions and dreams respectively. In connection with the last, I miss a reference to Stählin, *Das Motiv der Mantik im antiken Drama* (1912). The final chapter deals with their attitude toward Dionysus, Apollo, and Athena.

Dr. Manning is to be congratulated upon the philological craftsmanship which he displays. It would have been easy, however, to extend the list of particulars in which Euripides reverted to Aeschylean usage: for example, his use of stichomythy as described by Gross, *op. cit.*, pp. 35, 59, etc., and his employment of fear as an entrance motive for actors (cf. Harms, *De Introitu Personarum in Euripidis et Novae Comoediae Fabulis* [1914], p. 29).

Mr. Phoutrides' essay falls into three parts: "Defence of Supposed Faults," "Characteristics of the Euripidean Chorus," and "The Hyporcheme." In the first of these he shows (a) that Euripides' choruses sing or speak an average of 21 per cent of the lines in each play as against 43 per cent in Aeschylus and 20 per cent in Sophocles, and that the poet ought to be acquitted of the charge of having shortened the choral parts. He grants (b) that in certain plays the choral participation in the dialogue is curtailed, but maintains that this is not an arbitrary innovation of Euripides but in true accordance with the character of the chorus in each case—an explanation which only restates the problem and does not solve it. In (c) he defends the relevancy of the odes, and in (d) denies that a gradual decline of the chorus can be traced in a chronological arrangement of the plays. I venture to think that the author has made his task more difficult in these two sections

by refusing to take cognizance of my paper on Agathon's *embolima* in Vol. VII of this *Journal*. A reference to Professor Capps's article in the *American Journal of Archaeology*, X, 287 ff., has been inadvertently omitted both here and in ii (c).

The second part treats of the religion, humanity, and action of the chorus and Euripides' use of a second chorus. In the discussion of the last topic Gräber's *De Poetarum Atticorum Arte Scaenica* (1911), pp. 56 ff., ought to have been taken into account. On p. 113, note 2, Verrall's *The Bacchants of Euripides and Other Essays* (1910) should be added to the bibliography cited.

In the last part, after a careful examination of the ancient *testimonia*, the author decides that a hyporcheme was "a *melos* adapted for at least two different orchestric movements, one subordinated to the other," that it was "essentially mimetic, and that its verses were composed in so rapidly moving rhythm that both song and dance rendered the moods of the participants restless and impatient" (pp. 146 and 154). In Sophocles' *Ajax*, vss. 693 ff., he recognizes a hyporcheme with certainty and by inference therefrom also in four other plays of Sophocles, in four of Aeschylus, and in five of Euripides.

The dominant note of Dr. Phoutrides' paper is the freshness of treatment, possibly due to racial sympathy. We never get the impression that we are dealing with "dead" literature or that Euripides is "with yesterday's seven thousand years." The Greek playwright is discussed as if he were no more ancient than Ibsen and as if his message were no less valuable. I cannot commend this feature too highly.

ROY C. FLICKINGER

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

---

*Pliny. Letters.* In two volumes. With an English translation by WILLIAM MELMOTH, revised by W. M. L. HUTCHINSON. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: William Heinemann, 1915. Pp. xvi+535+440. \$1.50 each.

The Loeb Classical Library has not always insisted upon brand-new translations for its issues, but never before have the managers sanctioned the reprinting of a version well on in the second century of its age. Lest it be imagined that this circumstance makes the present volumes a mere poor relation in the Loeb family of classics, it may be said that the reviser's work seems to have removed the obvious disadvantages of such an antiquated version, and, in the second place, that Melmoth was an ideal person to translate Pliny and his times ideal times in which to do it. Perhaps no modern translator could so closely imitate in English the artificial graces of Pliny's style; for Melmoth was just such a letter-writer as Pliny himself, and possessed of considerable talent; and, on the whole, it is better to let a citizen of those days, when letter-writing was esteemed an art, turn Pliny into the

classical English form than, in the twentieth century, to attempt to reproduce the manner of the eighteenth. Melmoth, of course, had to be corrected. He wrote far too profusely, in the first place, and he often mistranslated. But as far as can be shown by comparison of several letters from various parts of the present collection with Melmoth's edition of 1757 (the first edition was in 1746), the reviser seems to have carried out his task wisely and well. Let it be hoped that through this popular translation many readers may find quiet amusement as they see through the thoroughly obvious affectation of this Roman gentleman, so anxious for estimation as a literary genius, the many amiable qualities of Pliny, and his really eminent place in history as a lawyer, financier, administrator, letter-writer, and friend of great men.

This edition cannot be expected to fulfil the demands for an authoritative critical and exegetical publication of the *Letters*, and Mr. Hutchinson very properly does not attempt anything of the sort. His critical and explanatory notes, his introduction, and the notice of the manuscript tradition are all calculated to fill the wants of the casual reader. It may be remarked that Codices R and F do not contain Books i-v entire, as he seems to imply; R extends only through v. 6. 32 (p. 127, 13 of Kukula's edition). The propriety of reprinting the Bipons text, too, in preference to Keil and Kukula, or to Merrill in the portions which the latter has edited, may be questioned, but the critical notes appended will probably offset whatever difficulty may be thus incurred.

FRANK EGLESTON ROBBINS

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

*Oidipus. Geschichte eines poetischen Stoffs im griechischen Altertum.*

By CARL ROBERT. Weidmann: Berlin, 1915. 2 vols. Pp. 587; 204.

The wealth of material and learning in this book makes it impossible to give it an adequate review. A hint may be obtained from the Table of Contents: i, "Die Kultstätten des Oidipus: Eteonos, Sparta, Attika"; ii, "Die Sphinx"; iii, "Oidipus, König von Theben"; iv, "Eteokles und Polyneikes und der Bruderkrieg"; v, "Das Epos"; vi, "Das Drama: Die thebanische Trilogie des Aischylos, Der erste Oidipus des Sophokles, Der Oidipus des Euripides, Die Antigone des Sophokles, Die Antigone des Euripides, Die Phoinissen des Euripides, Der zweite Oidipus des Sophokles"; vii, "Oidipus bei den übrigen Tragikern und in der Paradoxographie"; viii, "Oidipus in der Mythographie." The second volume contains notes to the eight chapters and an index to the whole work.

All scholars know the equipment of the author and therefore will be prepared for the elaborate treatment of the story of Oedipus which Robert has given us. He deals with religion, mythology, topography, poetry, both



epic and dramatic, mythography, and archaeology. In the first chapter he discusses the places with which the cult of Oedipus was connected and decides that the "authentic" burial-place was not Colonos but Eteonos, a town situated on the north side of Citheron, where there was once actual worship of the hero, as we are informed by the scholiast to Sophocles, *O.C.* 91. The Spartan tradition the author connects with the settlement of a Boeotian family in that land; and he believes that the Attic tradition, which makes Colonos the hero's resting-place, can hardly be regarded as having a Boeotian basis. Apparently the death of Oedipus was localized on that hill toward the end of the sixth century, as the result of certain historical events. On the Areopagus the hero's grave was marked by an altar, but the tradition which was there represented is apparently later than that which named Colonos as his burial-place. Robert therefore concludes that Eteonos alone had any claim to a genuine cult of Oedipus. But the splendor of Sophocles' genius created for antiquity, as it has for us, the belief that Colonos was the authentic spot; yet to the mind of the author this is contrary to historic facts.

With regard to the Sphinx, Robert holds firmly to the familiar theory that she was originally a Phix, a local creature whose form was gradually developed under the influence of Egyptian types; connection between her and the riddle is apparently late, the poetic form of the riddle being derived from some lost epic.

In his treatment of King Oedipus, Robert deals somewhat vigorously with tradition. The hero was originally, according to him, a chthonic hero, belonging to Demeter's circle, who was, so to speak, drawn out of his lair and provided with ancestors for myth-making purposes. The story of the exposure of the babe is one familiar in the folk-tales of almost every people; and there was another tradition of the exposure of the child in a chest.

Into Robert's study of the topography of the country where Laius and Oedipus met, we may not go, but the whole question is discussed with fulness and care. The blinding and the exile of Oedipus, which play so important a part in the Sophoclean story, may perhaps not have been known to the Homeric poet, but they provided the necessary material for the drama. The story of the later struggles about Thebes may have grown out of an actual war between that city and Argos, or it may be a composite or moving picture of many wars during the second millennium before our era.

Nor will the limits of a review allow one even to summarize the long sixth chapter, in which most readers will find their chief interest. We can only note that the plays in which the Theban story is handled by the three great dramatists are discussed with great care and thoroughness. Especially interesting is the careful way in which Robert sets forth the development and the modification of the myth in the works of these tragedians down to the *Phoenissae* of Euripides. Here the story reaches its final literary form; for Sophocles in the *O.C.* adopts his rival's innovations.

In the later chapters the story is traced through the other tragedians, the paradoxographers, and the mythographers down to the Byzantine period. The work throughout is well illustrated from vase paintings, photographs, and sculptures. Indeed it would be hard to find any material bearing on the Theban tale which Robert has not marshaled in full strength. In detail many will raise objections here and there, but all must recognize that the work is of the highest order, and that it must be considered by all who touch its theme.

CLIFFORD H. MOORE

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

---

*The Jews among the Greeks and Romans.* By MAX RADIN. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1915. Pp. 421.

This is a study of the political and social status of the Jews in Greece, Rome, and Egypt from about 586 B.C. to the later Roman Empire. The author's task was made easier by the work of M. Théodore Reinach, who in his *Textes d'auteurs grecs et latins relatifs au judaïsme* collected and translated the fragmentary texts, with explanatory footnotes. Besides these fragments Mr. Radin depends on Philo, Josephus, whom he despises as a renegade Jew, but cannot do without, and the remains of the mass of literature in Greek which was written for Greek-speaking Jews, for example, the Apocrypha, in part, whether originals or translations from the Hebrew. The first half of the book deals with the Greeks, their religious and racial concepts, and the resulting attitude toward the Jews. In the account of Greek religious concepts, which is naturally very brief, I note that on p. 32 Mr. Radin speaks of the "solar-myth theory" of the Greek gods as confined to the nineteenth century, and in a note on p. 375 he says that the term is now rarely used. He will find that in recent literature, and notably in A. B. Cook's *Zeus*, almost every divine or heroic figure in Greek tradition is still likely to be explained as a "faded solar god." He gives only a bare outline of the history of the Jews down to the invasion of the East by Alexander. Then with the rise of the Ptolemies the Jews begin to be regarded as a separate nationality in extant Greek writers. Here then begins the tale of the Jewish struggle against, and lapses into, Hellenism and of the Greek dislike of what Hecataeus called their "inhospitable and inhuman way of living" as ordained by Moses. They were ridiculed for their credulity, strangely enough, by both Greeks and Romans—"Tell it to the Jews," says Horace—nor did this mean merely that they were superstitious, for that was orthodox enough; but they were accused of naïveté, a crime, and their religious ceremonies and abstinences were dull. It was unreasonable to spend "cold Sabbaths," ψυχρὰ σάββατα, as Meleager calls them. And to be unsociable, to hold aloof, was worse. Though this book is not apologetic or controversial, the author naturally

explains away in some cases or softens the evidence, and with perfect justice as a rule. When we come to the treatment of the Jews by the Romans, it is obvious that they were persecuted no more than the other oriental sects and only when they seemed to make too many proselytes. They were never as popular in Rome as were the followers of the more emotional Syrian and Persian cults, but they were successful enough in their propaganda to be from time to time alarming, and were persecuted enough to be driven to revolt. Mr. Radin gives an account of the more serious Jewish revolts down to Severus, and ends with a sketch of their legal position under the later Empire.

The style of the book is good, and in the notes there are full references to the literature of the subject. On p. 93 for *προσκυνεῖν* read *προσκυνᾶν*; on p. 375 for Zeno read Zeus; on p. 293, for Pausanius read Pausanias. On p. 138 the phrase *στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ τὰ ὅπλα* is more correctly *ἐπὶ τῶν ὀπλῶν*.

WILMER CAVE WRIGHT

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

---

*Spain under the Roman Empire.* By E. S. BOUCHIER. Oxford: B. H. Blackwell, 1914. Pp. 200. 5s.

*Syria as a Roman Province.* By E. S. BOUCHIER. Oxford: B. H. Blackwell, 1916. Pp. 304. 6s.

Here are two volumes which possess considerable value for the student of Roman history. The author has divided the first volume into three parts: I, "History"; II, "Antiquities"; III, "Literature." Under "History" an introductory chapter deals with Spain down to the time of Augustus. The other chapters deal with Spain "From Augustus to Hadrian," "From the Antonine Age to the Gothic Conquest," and "Byzantine Andalusia." Under "Antiquities" the author treats of the "Native Races," "Natural Products," "The Arts," "Religion," and "Chief Cities." Literature is divided into "Spanish Writers of the Early Empire," "Christianity and Its Influence on Literature," and concludes with a chapter on "The Latin of Spain." A brief bibliography is given at the close of each chapter. The volume is small, but its author has gathered a great deal of information into its pages.

The method of treatment in the later volume is essentially the same as in the first, but without marking so definitely the divisions. It contains about twice as much material, but this naturally follows from the importance of the province of Syria. In the discussion of the chief cities, Jerusalem is omitted because of the mass of material readily accessible on that city. Of special interest might be mentioned the last chapters on "Early Literature," "Later Literature," "Religion and Architecture," and "The Arts." This volume contains a page of photographic reproductions of

some of the provincial coin-issues which are valuable in illustrating the architecture and religion of the province. Information afforded by epigraphy is used. A bibliography is given at the close of the volume as well as references to many works in the footnotes. Each volume contains an outline map and an index which add to their value. A few typographical errors were noticed, but they need not be mentioned. While neither volume aims to be exhaustive, yet the two will prove of great value to students in history and in the classics of the middle and later empire when a general but brief account of either province is desired. The books are quite readable and should find a place along with other works on Roman history.

D. T. SCHOONOVER

MARIETTA COLLEGE

---

*Das Griechentum in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung.* By RUDOLF VON SCALA. Teubner, 1915. Pp. 105. M. 1.25.

*Das Altertum in Leben der Gegenwart.* By PAUL CAUER. Teubner, 1915. Pp. 131. M. 1.25.

*Die Homerische Dichtung.* By GEORG FINSLER. Teubner, 1915. Pp. 113. M. 1.25.

These primers of the Teubner series "Aus Natur und Geisteswelt" are, notwithstanding their inexpensiveness, firmly bound in neat linen covers and printed on good paper in a clear type which is a pleasure as well as a comfort to the eye; and, save for occasional roughnesses of style which appear when the overabundance of material rebels against undue compression, they are very lucid and readable.

Professor von Scala's book, after an introductory sketch of the *Kultur* of the Indo-Germanic stem, attacks at once the difficult subject of the pre-historic peoples of Greece. We may perhaps complain that in his discussion of the Minoans, Mycenaeans, Achaeans, etc., and their relations to each other he states somewhat dogmatically now and then what is at best probable conjecture; but many readers, for whom the multitudinous results of the excavations in Crete and elsewhere still whirl about in unrelated confusion, will be grateful to a competent scholar for revealing to them some order in this chaos.

The treatment of the Homeric age is too scanty even for so brief a book, but in the later pages, which bring the story of Greece down to the fourth century A.D., the balance and emphasis are admirable. The book is not a mere outline of Greek history for beginners, but an account of Greek civilization in the making which it is worth the while of any Greek student to read. The text is illustrated by a considerable number of half-tones.

Professor Cauer's book is only incidentally what its title implies—a setting forth of “what we owe to Greece.” It would more properly be called “Die Culturmission des classischen Altertums in unserer Zeit,” which was the subject of a set of lectures out of which the book grew. But no single title is sufficiently elastic to stretch over its varied contents; it is partly a plea for the study of classical Greece in the pedagogy of German youth, but the place of ancient Rome in an ideal modern education is also emphasized at some length; it is, however, mainly a popular interpretation of the great achievements in literature, philosophy, politics, and art which Greek civilization offers as a stimulus and a corrective to the modern world. The book is everywhere marked by the clear thought, mature sanity, and wide knowledge which we should expect of the author, but it is directed to a general public and presents to the special student of the classics little more than a restatement of the obvious.

Finsler's previously issued studies of Homer are, I believe, well and favorably known. This little volume is condensed from his larger work on *Homer* and is mainly a recast of the chapter on “Homerische Poesie.” It does not, however, read in the least like a digest; the author brings fresh enthusiasm to the briefer labor of love which at times glows with a restrained eloquence of style. Whether he has, as he hopes, improved upon his earlier efforts will depend on the reader's point of view; those who prefer an objective treatment of Homer such as Professor Seymour has given us will not welcome the more pronounced obtrusion here of the author's personal theories about the Homeric question. They are, however, rather conservative: the *Iliad* is the work of one poet, Melesigenes of Smyrna (Homer is a by-name), who completed and wrote down this epic about 700 B.C.; his attempt to fuse into a single whole materials from independent sagas and poems fails of unity in the Aristotelian sense; inconsistencies and “unevennesses” reveal the poet staggering under the weight of his material; of course he archaizes (a chapter shows his “Streben nach Altertümlichkeit”), not only consciously, but painstakingly, and, with inevitable minor lapses, succeeds marvelously in setting a living picture in an ancient frame. The *Odyssey*, too, represents a fusion of distinct stories, but into a more perfect unity, by a single author who is simply “Der Dichter,” not Melesigenes-Homer.

Both epics are, however, drawn upon indifferently for the later chapters on the Homeric view of life and on the style and composition of the poems. The material of these chapters is crowded under too few captions and is not always arranged in logical sequence; the last chapter, “Heiterkeit der homerischen Welt,” makes an attractive conclusion but should not be separated from his chapter on Homeric life by the intervening treatment of composition and style.

GEORGE NORLIN

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

*Die baugeschichtliche Entwicklung des antiken Theaters.* By ERNST R. FLECHTER. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1914. 4to, pp. vii + 130 (text and index) + 86 (illustrations), 132 in all.

Of the theaters of the fifth and fourth centuries too little remains to make possible a satisfactory discussion of their architectural features. The reconstruction of the early theater rests largely upon literary tradition. But as the author is an architect, a comparison of the ruins with the literary documents is not attempted. Any adequate account of the archaeological development of the ancient theater must begin with the Hellenistic period. And for this the skênê at Oropos with its five θυρώματα (ἑρεῖς γενόμενος τὴν σκηνὴν καὶ τὰ θυρώματα) furnishes the clew. These openings were not closed by doors or panels, but formed with the space behind them a sort of portico, an inner stage, whose back wall was pierced by two or three (?) doors and was variously decorated to suit the needs of the dramatic performances. When desired, the θυρώματα could be closed by means of curtains. The outer stage was the podium of the proscenium. Before the Hellenistic period the Greek theater had no proscenium. This was an importation from abroad, probably from Southern Italy, introduced after the chorus had ceased to be a vital part of the drama.

The presence of θυρώματα in the theater at Ephesus and their more or less conjectural traces at Priene, Miletus, and possibly Pergamon suggest that the Hellenistic skênê regularly conformed to the type represented by the theater at Oropos, a view that is supported further by a consideration of Hellenistic wall-paintings from Pompeii and Boscoreale (Figs. 43-45, 47-50), as well as of the mosaic from the casa del poeta tragico at Pompeii (Fig. 51).

In the Roman theater the elaborate scaenae frons developed through successive modifications from the pillared scaenae frons and inner stage of the Hellenistic theater. Dörpfeld's view that the columned front of the proscenium was the forerunner of the Roman scaenae frons is wrong. The proscenium in the Hellenistic theater was stage, not background. Vitruvius' *theatrum Graecorum* is identical with the Hellenistic theater.

The reconstruction of the skênê of the pre-Hellenistic period is more difficult. Great obscurity shrouds the early and the middle portions of the fifth century. But about the year 427 (cf. Bethe, *Proleg.*, pp. 204 ff.) an imposing stage building appears to have been erected at Athens, probably of wood like the Odeum of Pericles and with deep paraskenia. These must have enclosed a stage, albeit a low stage. Aesthetic considerations permit no other conclusion. The appearance of the scaenae frons at this period is unknown, but it probably resembled that of the later theater at Oropos, minus the proscenium.



Thus the Hellenistic skênê is the earlier skênê of the theater at Athens with or without paraskenia and elevated some 10-12 feet to accommodate the imported proscaenium.

An adequate criticism of this thesis and its supporting arguments would require a treatise. The author, who is a professor of the history of architecture in the Technical College at Stuttgart, frankly acknowledges his slight acquaintance with the literary evidence and is apparently ignorant of much of the recent literature upon the subject of the ancient drama. Opposed to Dörpfeld, he supports Puchstein and especially Bethe, whose *Prolegomena* is cited again and again with evident approval. Indeed, Bethe is his chief, not to say sole, authority for the history of the Greek drama, and his own views are colored accordingly.

There is a useful chronological table of the best-known theaters of Greece and Asia Minor (pp. 24-27), and a comprehensive discussion, with numerous excellent illustrations, of the vases, wall-paintings, reliefs, and mosaics which are supposed to reflect the architectural features of the Hellenistic and Roman stage-buildings. The list of the Roman theaters is a welcome summary. In point of illustrations this is the most elaborate single publication upon the ancient theater since Wieseler's *Theatergebäude*.

JAMES TURNER ALLEN

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

---

*The Birds of the Latin Poets.* By ERNEST WHITNEY MARTIN, Associate Professor of Greek. Stanford University, California: Published by the University, 1914. Pp. 260. \$1.00.

This subject has now and then been touched by writers on natural science; witness Conrad von Gestner (*Historia Animalium*, 1551-58). Systematic cultivation of the field, however, dates from recent years. Prominent among the investigators are Professor W. W. Fowler, whose publications on birds began to appear in 1895, and Professor D. W. Thompson, who put forth in the same year *A Glossary of Greek Birds*, which now ranks as a standard work.

Professor Martin's book, which is similar in plan to the one just mentioned, gives us a "picture of the Roman attitude toward bird life as reflected in their greatest poets." The subject-matter takes the form of a check-list, each bird being made the subject of a separate article. At the outset of an article the author deals with the bird's name, listing the Latin, Greek, and English forms, as well as the modern scientific name and, if there be such, American literary parallels; e.g., "redwing" for blackbird or "redbreast" for robin. As regards identification of species, nothing new has been attempted. Next appear the titles of certain English and American poems

bearing more or less closely on the bird under discussion. The article concludes with a collection of Latin and English poetical quotations. Those in Latin are sometimes translated into English. Occasionally a whole poem is included. If the quotations are numerous, as under names like *cycnus* or *columba*, they are subdivided into groups according to subject-matter. We find now and then references to Latin prose authors and to modern journals. At the end of the book there are three rather full notes dealing with certain general aspects of bird life, and one on the derivation of *ruscinia*. The work is equipped with an explanatory preface, with bibliography and an index of citations from Roman authors. The quotations from modern literature, as a rule, show the names of the writers, but do not indicate the works from which they are drawn. One often misses the full citation. Misprints unfortunately occur: e.g., *Amor.* II, 37 for *Am.* II, 6, 37 on page 192; *Am.* 6, 29 for *Am.* II, 6, 29 on page 193. *Trist.* I, 6, 169 on page 218 is a false reference. The book is marred here and there by a lax English sentence and falls somewhat short of the ideal in logical arrangement.

On the whole, however, Professor Martin has rendered a good service and we shall profit by his work. He is an enthusiast and his observations are interesting. To the old question, for example, why the ancients often associated sadness with the song of birds, he answers:

This prevalent Roman feeling is due, in my judgment, to the widespread ancient belief in the metamorphosis association. Their favorite birds were not thought of merely as birds *per se*, but rather as human beings who had been changed into the birds in question. The nightingale and swallow were still Philomel and Progne. This is probably the clue to the rather curious choice of the swan and halcyon as typical song birds. This Roman point of view is the key to the interpretation of the rather frequent literal descriptions of actual metamorphoses scattered through the Latin poets. Horace, assuming before our eyes the form of a swan, is an example of this peculiar usage.

LEON J. RICHARDSON

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

---

*Studi di Letteratura e Filologia Latina.* By ETTORE STAMPINI.  
Torino, 1917. Pp. 447.

Ettore Stampini, the veteran Turin Latinist, has collected in this volume, which is to be followed by others, his opuscula dating from the beginning of his professional career in 1880 and continuing to 1916. In the present volume ten articles are reprinted: four on Virgil, three on Lucretius, and one each on early Latin meters, the *Carmina Triumphalia*—their ribald character being apotropaic—and on the painter Plautius. In an appendix are several interesting Latin letters of congratulation, mostly in the name of his university, that are interesting for the ingenuity of the expression of modern terms in the classic language. The most valuable article is the one on the suicide of Lucretius, originally published in 1896, which is still the best and

most detailed discussion of Jerome's brief biography of the poet, with criticism of all the theories founded on its interpretation. The other two Lucretian articles are on textual questions. The first Virgil article is on the old question of the poet's name—Vergilius in Latin and Virgilio in Italian: is it conceivable that an English poet could speak of Vergil? Politian was the first to write Vergilius, Stampini patriotically declares. Another paper is a detailed estimate, verse by verse, of the philological work done on the *Bucolics* down to 1905; the discussion of the Fourth Eclogue is especially full and valuable.

It is interesting to an American student to see how well acquainted the author is with the results of German, French, and English scholarship, and that our American contributions are appreciated by him. One gets the impression that in Italy Stampini's is a *vox clamantis*, and American scholars can sympathize with him. We are too likely to forget that the cause of sound learning, like righteousness, has always been in peril everywhere and at all times. *Facilis descensus* holds of education as well as of everything else human. There has been no Golden Age of culture. The torch has been handed on from age to age, often in weariness and despair. But classical culture will last as long as our Western civilization in spite of systematic and subsidized depreciation.

W. A. MERRILL

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

---

*Selections from Catullus.* Translated into English Verse with an Introduction on the Theory of Translation by MARY STEWART. Boston: Richard G. Badger, 1915. Pp. 71. \$1.00.

The book under review contains verse translations of thirty-five to forty of the shorter poems of Catullus, prefaced by an introduction in which two points are of particular interest. The first is the author's theory of translation. She believes that "even if it were possible for all of us to learn Latin and Greek well enough to read the great epics, it would scarcely be worth while for all of us to do it." Of course there is implied here a saving reservation, but the words can easily be overinterpreted. I have tried to teach Latin literature by means of English translations, and it is in the case of this very Catullus that I felt the greatest despair. The point of an epigram of Martial is so apparent that an approximate translation is possible, but the subtlety of Catullus is often untranslatable. That does not mean that there is no place for translations, merely that they must be taught to know their place. Miss Stewart rightly distinguishes between the literature of information and the literature of beauty, and for the latter she sets forth two principles that should guide the translator: (1) the translation should interest the generation for which it is written and should be in idiomatic English without any concession to the language of the original; (2) it must

preserve the spirit of the original. But theory is one thing and practice is another. The second point of particular interest in the introduction is the attack on the literalists who believe that "a particular flesh-and-blood Phyllis jilted the poet on the particular morning in May on which he sings," and who "otherwise honest will turn their imaginations loose on 'internal evidence' and deduce therefrom the most egregious lies in the shape of specific facts." Miss Stewart argues that many poems are the result of love denied, that "the satisfied lover needs no poem of ecstasy; his beloved is his poem. The despairing lover needs no verse of woe; his broken heart is his cry." There is a great deal in all this, but opinions will differ as to the amount. Judging from these words and from the fact that in the two Juvenius poems in the book (48, 99) Miss Stewart substitutes the name of Lesbia for that of Juvenius, it would seem that she doubts the reality of the affair with Juvenius. Perhaps the wish is father to the thought.

The translations themselves vary considerably in excellence. Some are good throughout, others are good in spots; some are fairly faithful, others are mere paraphrases. A translation may be faithful without being literal: "sweet bird" is fine for *passer* (2), and "So many kisses, not one less" (7) is splendidly faithful, though the last three words have no parallel in the original. But the jest in "And men of feeling everywhere | Forget to smile—until tomorrow" (3) is mere concession to rhyme, as is "Jove's shrine of mystic gloom" for *Iovis aestuosi* (7). It is difficult to criticize when the reviewer differs from the author in the application of principles. Is a given line or word the result of misinterpretation, misprint, or deliberate choice? Shall one object to Veranus for Veranius (9), Caecii for Caesii (14), to Hortalus in the text and Orталus in the note to 65? What shall one say of constant expansion of Catullus' neatly phrased thought? In poem 34 Catullus' twenty-four lines are expanded to thirty-six, while the eighteen lines of poem 35 are dragged out to forty-six, with change of order and insertion of new ideas. Shall one find fault with "You've scarcely any nose at all" for Catullus' *nec minimo puella naso* (43), and with "lips as parched as last year's peas" for *nec ore sicco*? Is it intentional that in poem 51 "greater than the gods is he | Whom they permit to sit near thee" the application of the words *si fas est* is transferred? By the way, Miss Stewart is altogether too certain that the last stanza belongs to a different poem.

But with all this implied criticism, it should be said that if we cannot always find Catullus himself in this little volume, his spirit hovers about it. A better title for most of the poems would be "Echoes from Catullus." The poems that are most faithfully rendered are 2, 5, 9, 13, 31, 38 (the omission of verbs by the sick poet is well preserved), 70. The handsome appearance of the volume makes one regret the misprints, few though they be. A curious one is "incite" for "insight" (p. 18).

B. L. ULLMAN

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

*Auswahl aus den Iliasscholien zur Einführung in die antike Homer-philologie.* Von WILHELM DEECKE. Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen. Herausgegeben von Hans Lietzmann, Nr. 111. Bonn: A. Marcus und E. Weber, 1912. Pp. 90. M. 2.40.

In this small pamphlet the editor attempts to give a contracted but faithful conception of the meaning, wealth, and sources of the Homeric scholia. First, ten scholia are selected which show the material with which the Alexandrian scholars worked, such as the city manuscripts, αἱ κατὰ πόλεις, and private manuscripts, αἱ κατ' ἄνδρα. Whence these manuscripts came is shown by scholia containing such phrases as ἡ Μασσαλιωτική, ἡ Ἀργολική, ἡ Σινωπική, κτλ.

Six pages are given to scholia illustrating the work and methods of Zenodotus, two pages to Aristophanes, while to Aristarchus, as the most important, twenty pages are given. Practically all the references to Aristarchus are from Ven. A, and accordingly show the traditional Aristarchus of Lehrs and Cobet. Two pages are given to Didymus, and a like number to Aristonicius. Herodian's work in prosody and accentuation is illustrated by four pages of carefully chosen scholia, and five pages show the importance of the studies of Nicanor in the matter of Homeric punctuation.

Six pages are given to the comments of Porphyrius, and two lengthy quotations illustrate the rationalistic theories of Heraclitus. Fairly full and complete quotations from *ABTD* to I, 223-51, give some notion of the mass and variety of learning preserved by the early commentators. Two pages are devoted to the scholia found in the newly discovered Geneva manuscript, G. The pamphlet ends with Eratosthenes' discussion of the origin and names of the Pleiades.

Although the space given to the different scholars whose work has found a place in the scholia is limited, yet the selection is made with such fine discrimination that it gives a fairly accurate representation of the traditional views. This abridgment is to be warmly commended to the attention of those who cannot find the time to read the complete scholia.

JOHN A. SCOTT

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

*Iulii Firmici Materni Matheseos libri VIII*, ediderunt W. KROLL et F. SKUTSCH in operis societatem assumpto K. ZIEGLER. Fasciculus alter libros iv posteriores cum praefatione et indicibus continens. Leipzig: Teubner, 1913. Pp. lxxvii+559. M. 12.

At last we have a complete edition of the *Mathesis* of Firmicus Maternus which meets the requirements of modern scholarship. And it was time that Firmicus, the chief extant Latin writer on astrology, should be restored to

us in a worthy form. Considerable portions of the third, fourth, and fifth books were published as early as 1487 as part of a work entitled *Opus Astro-labii plani in tabulis*, but the editio princeps of the complete work was brought out at Venice in 1497; two years later the Aldine appeared. On this last were based the editions of 1503, 1533, and 1551. For over three centuries the work was neglected until Sittl brought out his unfortunate text (Part I) in 1894. Then Kroll and Skutsch undertook the task of preparing a new edition, of which the first volume was published in 1907; in 1908 Ziegler was associated with the two older editors, and since Skutsch's untimely death he has borne the chief burden of completing the work.

The editors deserve the gratitude of scholars for the care and skill which they have devoted to their difficult task. No less than thirty-four manuscripts have been taken into account, many of them sadly interpolated or defective; the best of these are three of the eleventh century: Montepessulanus H 180, Parisinus 7311, and Vaticanus reginae 1244. But it is impossible here to summarize the tradition, and reference must be made to the editors' valuable praefatio. Four elaborate indices are given; the last of these is apparently a complete index verborum, for which all classicists interested in the history of the Latin language will be grateful.

The growing interest in the history of ancient astrology makes this edition of the chief Latin work especially welcome. How much the student of civilization in the fourth century may learn from the *Mathesis* has been already suggested by Thorndike's article, "A Roman Astrologer as a Historical Source: Julius Firmicus Maternus," *Classical Philology*, VIII, 415 ff. Into the various questions connected with the text and content of the *Mathesis* this is not the place to go, but we may expect to see a number of studies stimulated by this trustworthy edition.

CLIFFORD H. MOORE

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

---

*De l'aspect verbal en Latin ancien et particulièrement dans Térence.*

By D. BARBELENET. Paris: Champion, 1913. Pp. vi+478.

This study is based on the *Persa* and the *Poenulus* of Plautus, the six plays of Terence, selected parts of Caesar, Cicero, Varro, Lucretius, Vergil, and the letters of Caelius. Aspect is "en somme la durée définie ou indéfinie prêtée à l'action par le sujet parlant" (p. 25; i.e., *Aktionsart*). There are in Latin two aspects, and two only: the imperfective and the perfective; the imperfective "exprime l'état permanent, l'action uniforme indéfiniment prolongée" (p. iii); the perfective "exprime l'action en tant qu'elle met fin à une situation antérieure." (p. iii; cf. p. 451). Cf. Varro, *L.L.* ix. 96-98. Other words used by the author for subdivisions are duratives, iteratives,



frequentatives, consecutives. Two classes of verbs do not admit of aspect: (1) technical terms; (2) those that, having a strong prepositional sense, do not show any iterative (p. 429). Nearly all perfectives are compound verbs.

M. Barbelenet strives throughout to avoid "judgments purely subjective" (p. 25); yet there are many cases where he cannot decide between the two aspects. He proceeds in orderly fashion, and at great length, to discuss the matter under such headings as imperfect indicative, historical infinitive, present participle, present perfective (including an elaborate theory to show why *dum* takes a present tense, chap. vi), compounds with *con-*, *ex-*, *de-*, etc., etc. (pp. 425-27). He then applies his principles to the explanation of selected passages, of some length, from Terence, Plautus, Caesar, Cicero, Caelius, Lucretius (pp. 429-49).

The author sums up his work on pp. 451-52. The contrast between imperfective and perfective "*ne recouvre nullement l'opposition du présent et de l'aoriste en grec ou en indoiranien*" (p. 451). In the matter of aspect, Terence and Caesar are each *puri sermonis amator* (p. 441); but Plautus and the other authors studied show less and less accurate feeling for aspect as time goes on; yet it would be hard to determine just when aspect ceased to be felt. A comparison of certain passages in St. Luke with the translation of the Vulgate shows that aspect did not exist in Latin in the time of St. Jerome (p. 15). M. Barbelenet surmises that certain related phenomena in French may be inheritances from Latin, rather than recent inventions (p. 452). In certain tenses, one of the two aspects seems, from the nature of things, to show a considerable predominance (p. 451). He thinks that the whole matter is decidedly obscured by the fact that the notion of aspect has not, in Latin, an adequate morphological expression. It is in Latin only an accessory phenomenon; it is far from playing the same part that it does in Greek or in Slavic.

The book shows an immense amount of labor and of painstaking, though many glaring misprints betray careless proofreading. It practically amounts to an attempt to give a more or less scientific commentary on the common observation that, in general, compound verbs are more frequent than their corresponding simple verbs. As aspect is in Latin rather an "accessory phenomenon," in many cases the author's painstaking fails to lead to solid and clean-cut results; he is often forced to use the expressions "aspect indécis," "aspect peu net"; and he does not make it wholly clear why his two classes of exceptions do not admit of the idea of aspect. It is a very suggestive book, as breaking ground in a practically new field of Latin study; but it leaves the reader with a strong feeling of regret that the results obtained are not more in proportion to the pains and energy devoted by the author to his work.

ARTHUR WINFRED HODGMAN

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

*Case Usage in Livy.* III, The Accusative. IV, The Ablative. By R. B. STEELE. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1912 and 1913.

The title of these papers suggests a purely syntactical treatise on the accusative and ablative in Livy. As a matter of fact, however, the study is to a certain extent semasiological; and the writer himself apparently views the whole as essentially stylistic. The material is presented for the most part merely in selection, as it is the author's purpose to give a general bird's-eye view of the whole field, without special scrutiny of details. Such a plan is not without its advantages, but viewed from the strictly scientific standpoint it limits seriously the value of a work.

Thus, in the papers here under discussion, the syntactical reader will not be particularly interested to learn that the great mass of accusatives and ablatives in Livy can be brought within the categories commonly recognized by the grammars; and he will not linger long over the abundant illustrations given under these heads. On the other hand, he would much appreciate just what the author does not profess to give, namely, a complete and critical account of the particulars in which Livy's usage differs from that of other historical prose writers.

The student of semasiology and the thoroughgoing stylist will have a similar experience in reading these articles. It is a matter for regret that the writer, after having taken the trouble to amass such a store of material, should not have extracted more data of interest to the specialist. For the general philological public he has produced very readable papers. The occasional confusing lack of commas, and other minor infelicities are doubtless to be accounted for largely on the basis of the fact that the printer was so far beyond the author's reach.

H. C. NUTTING

---

*Clio Enthroned: A Study of Prose-Form in Thucydides.* By WALTER R. M. LAMB, Late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Cambridge: University Press, 1914.

The purpose of Mr. Lamb's book may be found in this statement (p. 7): "An examination of the literary movements of the fifth century should throw some fresh light, not only on the works of Thucydides and his contemporaries but also, perhaps, on some of those discussions in which the eloquence of Plato appears as the genuine, if rather ungrateful, heir of the sophistic inventions." So he proceeds to a search first among the fragmentary relics of the early prose writers for the steps by which the style of Thucydides was formed. But before entering directly upon this search he makes, after discussing "The General Aim of the History" in chap. i, a digression in chap. ii entitled "Allurements of Urania," to take issue with Cornford's thesis set forth in *Thucydides Mythistoricus*. "The 'myth-historic theory,' says Lamb,

raises a suspicion concerning the mind of Thucydides which casts a lurid doubt upon the accuracy of the whole picture"; and the main grounds for this suspicion in the body of the narrative are then examined. "The skeleton of a connected dramatic design," which Cornford has set up for Thucydides, resulting in the conclusion that "after all, Thucydides was only an amateur tragedian," is examined from other points of view, but with especial reference to the Sphacterian episode and the Mytilenaeen debate, as also in a later chapter on the "Melian Dialogue." To this reader—and the majority of unprejudiced readers will probably agree—the objections to Cornford's theory seem valid. The concluding words of the chapter I heartily endorse: "The conflict that we shall watch for and consider will not be one in which the servant of truth appears constricted by the rules and trappings of mythic drama; it will be the most obvious and measurable part of the issue joined by luminous art with laborious fidelity. In a certain limited sense, the decision will be seen to fall in favor of dramatic effect; but the settlement, if not perfect in formal harmony and smoothness, may yet claim to present the lively lineaments of a genuine history."

Chapter iii, on "The Mind of the Writer," seeks to determine the natural cast of Thucydides' mind, in order to enable us better to understand how he came to develop his peculiar style.

In chap. iv, on "Narrative Prose," as promised at the start, an examination is made of fragments from various earlier and contemporary prose writers. After some discussion of fragments of Hellanicus and certain passages of Herodotus, the most interesting part of the chapter is the discussion of Hippocrates, as promising ground in the search for the formative influences on Thucydides' style. But this discussion is neither so interesting nor so convincing as the next chapter, called "The Rhetorical Invasion," where along with Democritus, Protagoras, Prodicus, and Hippias, chief attention is given to the influence of Gorgias and Antiphon. The general result, so far as Gorgias is concerned, may be gathered from the following: "The fact remains that Thucydides grasped the importance of Gorgias' artifices for the progress of literary art. The chief benefit resulting to us now is the establishment of balance in the constitution of a sentence; though our properly tempered use of epigram has only been evolved by a continual warfare between brilliancy and common sense. Antithesis was bound to lead from a small to a large form, when practice in the craft was able to answer the calls of fuller thought; and from Gorgias came the impulse needed for the early stages of the process." After Gorgias, Antiphon was the next most important influence upon the style of Thucydides, though it may be doubted whether a study of Antiphon helps so much to a conception of his influence upon Thucydides as to an understanding of Gorgias' influence upon both of them. The chapter is the longest and best in the book, at once suggestive and interesting. The sophistic movement is given fair credit for its influence in the development of literary style here and elsewhere in the book.

If the chapter on "Personification" is somewhat disappointing, that on "Intonation" makes up for it. There the examples of formal resonance and rhythm—"deliberate appeals to the ear"—are very striking, showing for what effects Thucydides sometimes consciously and successfully strove, though seeking these poetic aids only at casual moments of intensity. How frequent are his appeals to the ear through trochaic, iambic, paeonic, and especially heroic endings will probably be a surprise to most readers, as certainly to me. "A careful search throughout the history provides no ground for suspecting that Thucydides attempted any elaborate metrical scheme, such as may be attributed to Isocrates. In large portions of the book there is no more sign of a recurrent scheme of feet than in the main substance of Herodotus. It is only because these occasional chimes—most markedly in the heroic cadence—are the sole indications of a care or inclination for rhythmic as distinct from assonant balance in Thucydides, that they deserve further attention."

The chapter on "Interpolation" is added because it is clear that "no just account of his different modes of expression can ignore this matter of interpolation, at least so far as concerns the larger 'adscripts' which are alleged to have crept into the text." One especially of the conclusions of this chapter seems sensible: "We must be prepared to find that, as his peculiar brevity exposed him to accretions of scholastic annotation, so his hope of being used by persons remote from his time and outlook has frequently moved him to insert his own explanatory allusions."

Inasmuch as the modern world will have to depend mainly upon translations for what it knows of Thucydides, a few lines from the "Conclusion" may be quoted here: "These references have perhaps suggested already the thorough-going infidelity of the current translations of the History. None of these bears traces of any adequate attempt to give Thucydides his proper rank and significance in literature: they give hardly a sign of his experimental ardour, as it appears in the chief varieties of his style. Too constantly the translator has endeavored to set forth, not the author's taste and dexterity, but his own."

C. F. SMITH

MADISON, WIS.

